THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In *The Twilight of Civilization*[1] we have the most recent thoughts of Jacques Maritain about the present situation in the world. The gist of the book may be said to be this: that there is urgent need of a new Humanism and that this is in preparation in the contemporary death struggle of humanity. Humanism generally he defines as a movement that enables man to partake of everything in Nature and in history capable of enriching him.

Obviously we cannot exclude from this the wisdom of Ancient Greece, the brand of Humanism which, since the Renaissance, has occupied the last three centuries. One defect of this type of Humanism is not in what it affirms about man but in what it denies, in what it excludes, in its anthropocentric concept of man and culture. All the suprarational truths are 'either stuck between parentheses or finally denied.' The other defect is that this Humanism simply has not worked. The unfolding of history has shown this clearly enough. After having put God aside in order to be self-sufficient, man loses his soul. And there follows on this an irrationalist tidal wave which we are now witnessing.

This irrationalism finds noble forms of expression in such thinkers, for instance, as Nietzsche, or even Kierkegaard, Karl Barth and Chestov. It is on the highest grounds that these men undertake to defend man against reason. But it must be said that, with whatever intelligence one attacks the value of intelligence, and with whatever generosity one tries to save human values, this position definitely gives rise to what might be called a *counter-humanism*. And the trouble with all forms of noble counter-humanism is that inevitably men end by substituting for them the meanest forms. In the end Nietzsche gives way to Herr Rosenberg.

After a preliminary glance at Marxism, Maritain turns to a statement of what in his view is the urgent matter at present, the new Humanism which must assume again and lift up into a purified atmosphere all the work of the classical period. It must discover the 'rehabilitation' of the creature, not in a species of isolation but in an opening up of the creature to the universe of the divine and the suprarational. And as a matter of fact such a task implies a work of sanctification of the profane and the temporal. It means the discovery of a more profound sense of the dignity of the human person. As a consequence, man would rediscover himself in God rediscovered, and would direct social work towards an heroic ideal of fraternal love. Such a Humanism which sets no *a priori* limits to the descent of the divine into man, could be termed *the Humanism of the Incarnation*.

So much for the general theme. Maritain then goes on to deal with the 'Great anti-Christian Forces' which are the cause of the 'twilight' of Western civilization and the real problem before the writer's mind. These are the different forms of Totalitarianism. He begins with German Racism which he describes as a pathological protestation of Nature in which instinct is exalted above reason and animality surges up from the abyss. Strangely, there arises at the same time a powerful religiosity. The idea of God is asserted, but at the same time it is disfigured and perverted. A god which identifies itself with some invincible force at work in the blood defies the God of Sinai and the God of Calvary. In this we are face to face, not with atheism but with a demonic pseudo-theism which is more corrupting than atheism.

On the other hand, the theory of historical materialism as Marx conceived it, implies an absolute atheistic position, for it implies a universal process of substitution of a dialectical movement of history for all transcendent causality and for the whole universe of Christianity generally. It implies, consequently, that the world of Nature and the world of humanity are a self-existing process of becoming. This idea is exclusive, by hypothesis, of all idea of divine causation. German Racism rejects all universality, breaking the natural unity of mankind in order to impose on the world its own higher racial essence, whereas

[1] Sheed and Ward; 3s. 6d. net.

Communism asserts a universality of its own, emancipating and all-embracing, against the idea of the mystical body of Christ.

Is Western civilization faced, then, with a desperate situation? Not if men and nations know the price to be paid for liberty and are ready for the task of renewal and redemption. The way to this is the integral Humanism already referred to. There are only two solutions of this modern problem. The one is the totalitarian way, turning men into robots which are kept in good working order by means of collective techniques, illusioned, standarized, poisoned with hate and lies. The other is the way of Christian Humanism which, taking account of the energies which man receives from above as well as the strength of his own spirit, swings open for man a gateway to a life and liberty truly worthy of the human person and its calling.

Concerning the social significance of such Humanism MARITAIN observes that it must assume the task of a profound transformation of the temporal order, and must substitute for a mercantile civilization, for an economy based on the fertility of money, not a collectivist economy but a 'personalist' civilisation and economy, in which would be found what MARITAIN calls 'a temporal refraction of the evangelic truths.' Which probably means a practical application of the gospel.

It does mean that, for the author goes straight on to say that what is needed is a profound renewal of the religious conscience. One of the evils of our time has been its dualism, its dissociation of the things of God from the things of the world. The latter (the facts of social, economic and political life) have been abandoned to a carnal law and divorced from the exigencies of the gospel. At the same time Christian morality, no longer vitalizing the social life of the nations, has become a thing of words and formulas, and these have been associated with activities which are detached from Christ.

There are some pages towards the end of his book into which MARITAIN has poured a flood of deeply earnest conviction. One of the deadly dangers of our time, he says, is self-sufficient politics. This is just the Paganism against which Christ stood, an organized empire of confident materialism which has a dynamic that might be overpowering but for the fact that God is more powerful. It makes the material and secular the supreme rule and measure, superior both to the eternal law and to the grace of God. MARITAIN does not find any hope of victory over this, as so many contemporary thinkers do, in any form of religious Totalitarianism, but in what he contends for as the substance of his message in this book, a renewed Humanism which has its centre not in itself but in the grace of God in Christ.

This is the more important as we consider what the future will hold for us. We look for a democracy as the form of government, but it must be a new democracy into which the Christian values are vitally integrated. Mr. Walter Lippmann has recently, and perhaps rather unexpectedly, spoken of a 'reconciliation which is now in progress, after more than a century of destructive conflict, between patriotic freedom, democracy and religion.' He believes that religion is the *source* of democracy, and that this is the positive answer of the West to the forces which threaten to destroy the Western world, to those forces of moral disintegration which Communism, Fascism, and Nazism exploit. This is the foundation of that reconstruction of their moral philosophy which the democracies must undertake if they are to survive. MARITAIN would identify this new democracy with the new Humanism which he envisages.

MARITAIN believes that it all goes back to the rediscovery of God, and so far he would go with Barth, if indeed Barth would go so far. Barth would at any rate express it differently. The vice of all contemporary philosophy, MARITAIN would agree, and all political thinking and action, is that it is anthropocentric. He would have his Humanism theocentric, but even so he is far from the standpoint of a true Barthian. It is interesting, however, and valuable to have the Humanist position, thus religiously integrated, put with such clearness and ability.

A talk which he gave recently to a group of clergy upon the subject 'Our people's war-time doubts about God' has now been expanded by the Rev. F. W. CAMFIELD, M.A., D.D., into a book, under the title of *The Collapse of Doubt*.[1] Dr. CAMFIELD is already known to many readers through an earlier book—'Revelation and the Holy Spirit'—in which he gave an able and sympathetic exposition of the theological principles of Barthianism. In his new book, concerned with a limited concrete field, these theological principles control Dr. CAMFIELD's interest and discussion.

[1] Lutterworth Press; 5s. net.

In his analysis of the nature and causes of doubt in the 'average man' of to-day Dr. CAMFIELD inclines to find the main sources in the impact upon him of natural theology. This sort of theology is nothing more than an optimistic world-view, and lies behind the frequent complaint 'Why does not God intervene?' Doubt breeds here because the professed faith is itself a failure to comprehend the character of power and purpose as divine realities. The characteristic of this doubt is that it is more distressed about calamity and physical suffering than it is about guilt and sin.

Here we have the differentia between the modern man and the Biblical man. The 'natural' doubts find indeed powerful expression in the Bible but they are there with a difference. Penitence is the Bible form of pessimism. In other words, the men of the Bible were more appalled by the fact of sin and guilt than by the miseries which flowed from them. In this experience of the reality of sin they knew God's hand upon them, and were moved to cry out for His healing and pardon. It is the blunting of the reality of sin that keeps doubt from collapsing.

To the frequent question then of the doubter, Why does not God intervene?, the only reply can be: Examine the witness to the God who has intervened and intervened decisively for sin and guilt. This is the Biblical God, the God of revelation. The main purpose in Dr. CAMFIELD's book is indeed to speak of the Christian doctrine of God and to urge that the man of to-day keep his thoughts concerning such free from naturalistic contaminations. The four last chapters set this forth. We indicate the scope of this exposition by simply giving their titles, 'The Mystery of Evil,' 'The Almighty,' 'The Sin-bearer,' 'The Good Fight of Faith.'

Everything depends, says Dr. CAMFIELD, for doubter and believer upon a true sense of God's power. The Almightiness of God is His personal activity in Christ, coming to us in a grace that pardons while it judges our wickedness, and so opens us a way of fellowship with Him that makes a new life possible. Because this God of Word and Grace can meet us in the central places of our life we shall not apply external measures to His presence and power in the whole of life. The way to the discovery of the objective certainty of God for modern man is through the subjective certainty of conscience declaring to him not his creaturely but his sinful nature.

Dr. CAMFIELD'S book does not make easy reading, and at times it seems to us to oscillate between two extreme positions: either that what is called *doubt* is not very serious at all, or that nothing like doubt can exist when the Christian message is heard. This may be to misinterpret the author's point of view but we have felt an element of confusion in the exposition. One other comment we should like to make. A recent book from the pen of the late Professor A. E. Taylor appeared with the title, 'Does God Exist?' According to Dr. CAMFIELD such a question is futile.

The question, Is there a God?, he says, 'leads nowhere and can lead nowhere.' The only question that can rightly be asked is, Is there a Word of God? In saying this Dr. CAMFIELD is adhering firmly to the Barthian idea of a complete severance between 'natural' theology and revelation. May not one consequence of this be that the full reality of doubt is minimized and the hurt of it too dogmatically healed? Is there a God? is a modern question, and one to be handled seriously, apart from 'church dogmatics.' 'I am not,' says A. E. Taylor, 'one of those who think that there can ever be a vital religion and a theology adequate to it independently of "revelation." But a man cannot be expected to receive anything as such a communication from God until he is at least satisfied that it is reasonable to believe there is *Some One* to make the communication.' This seems to us a view absolutely essential for a fully adequate approach to the content and finality of the gospel of the Word Incarnate.

Towards the Conversion of England.

The Situation before the Church.

By the Reverend Canon H. G. G. Herklots, Director of Religious Education, Diocese of Sheffield.

When James I became King of England in 1603 the Archbishop of Canterbury discovered through an inquiry that, out of a population which is computed to have been about four millions, not less than two and a quarter millions were communicants in the Church of England. Bishop Henson once contrasted this figure with one for the year 1927.[1] The population of the country was then nine times as great as in 1603, but only 3,686,422 people above the age of eighteen registered themselves—through the Electoral Rolls—as members of the Church, and the estimated number of communicants was slightly over two and a half millions. In a recent Report to Convocation on *Confirmation To-day* it is shown that 67 per cent. of children born in the country are still brought to the Church of England for baptism: but of these only 41 per cent. are later confirmed, and of this reduced number only 35 per cent. remain sufficiently faithful to make their Communion at Easter. Of every hundred, sixty-seven are baptized, twenty-seven are confirmed, and nine remain as Easter communicants. It is not surprising that many people are now speaking of England as being a 'post-Christian' country; one in which Christianity is still remembered, Christian conventions still followed, but in which the majority of people no longer publicly worship the Christian God. The Church of England has become, in Professor Brogan's phrase, 'the Church that the majority of English people stay away from.'[2]

Nor are these figures to be offset by any great accession of strength in the other Christian communions. Most would agree that all are 'in the same boat.' An estimate quoted in the Report of the Church Assembly Commission on Evangelism, which has prompted this series of articles, suggests that 'from 10 to 15 per cent. of the population are closely linked to some Christian church; that 25 to 30 per cent. are sufficiently interested to attend a place of worship upon great occasions; that 45 to 50 per cent. are indifferent to religion though more or less friendlily disposed towards it; while 10 to 20 per cent. are hostile.'[3] There are parts of the country—of the industrial towns and east London in particular—where the percentage of those who are 'closely linked to some Christian church' is very much smaller than ten. On the other hand, we are told that there are a considerable number of people who listen attentively to religious talks and services which are broadcast through the B.B.C., though they are not themselves members of any church. Is it possible that these may prove to be a new set of 'Godfearers' like those Gentiles who, first attracted by the teaching and worship of Jewish synagogues, later welcomed the Gospel preached by Christian missionaries?

Historically, of course, the coming of toleration and the growth of the Free Churches has displaced the Church of England from that position of pre-eminence which it possessed when James I came to the throne. But more important still was the coming of industrialism. With the beginnings of the Industrial Revolution at the end of the eighteenth century England began to become a mobile country. The Church of England remained static, unable to grapple on any large scale with the problem. 'At the beginning of the Industrial Revolution,' write the Hammonds, 'the Established Church hardly counted in the spiritual life of the districts where mines and factories began to collect these vast populations. In most of the places that were turned from rural solitudes into mining camps or textile towns, the Church scarcely existed for the poor except as the most unrelenting of the forces of law and order.'[4] It is true that John Wesley was, after all, a priest of the Church of England, but what increasingly separated his Society from the parent Church was just that it was dealing all the time with a living, changing situation, judging—perhaps too much—by practical results rather than by preconceived theory. It is true that the impulse of the Evangelical Revival expressed itself also through the Established Church, and that some of its lay leaders were foremost in the struggle for the emancipation of slaves and for factory legislation; and that the Oxford Movement sent priests to spend themselves, in Franciscan simplicity, amongst the degraded poor. It is true also, that in the mid-nineteenth century, under the inspiration of

[1] *Disestablishment*, 42. [2] *The English People*, 105.
[3] *Towards the Conversion of England*, p. 3 f.
[4] *The Town Labourer*, 272.

Bishop Wilberforce, there was much bustling activity. But this still expressed itself in terms of a static society, in bricks and mortar, and 'Soapy Sam' may well be the father of the activist heresy that the great task of the Church in the world is to pay off the debt on the parish hall. Still to the industrial masses the Church was not very relevant. It provided charity and it provided entertainment: nowadays one comes from the State and the other from private enterprise, much of it organized on a gargantuan scale. The Church appeared as a middle-class institution, condemning more often than it welcomed the efforts of wage-earners to secure better conditions of labour. This caused a deep-seated resentment which has lasted over the years. As one member of the Commission remarked: 'When the unbeliever looks at the Church he sees there the values that he hates.' This is true, of course, of what may be called the 'bad unbelievers,' of whom Hitler is the type: it is true also, for quite other reasons, of many 'good unbelievers,' who are working hard and sacrificially for their fellowmen. No Christian can long consider the 'situation before the Church' without realizing also that 'the time has come that judgment must begin at the house of God.'

With industrialism there came a new pattern of social living. The old paternal system was gone. As a Report of the British Council of Churches puts it: 'Of old, both father and mother worked side by side with their children throughout the working day. Under modern conditions they are almost certain to be widely scattered and the father may even come, through the necessities of his work, to be more often separated from his family than at home, even in leisure hours. The great change began with the break-up of the old domestic industries, which radically changed the habits of children young and old. The very long hours, spent hitherto in the home workshop, came then to be spent in the factory or mine, and the centre of disciplinary authority was transferred from the home to work, and later to the school. This development of centres of authority, other than the home, has continued ever since, so that to-day a child may be subject to conflicting instructors and the primary control of the family is not seen or made effective.' [1]

Of these external authorities the Church has become a very minor and subordinate one. (The visiting parson is a less familiar figure in many suburban streets than is the insurance agent, paying his quasi-pastoral call as he collects his premiums.) Often its authority is in conflict with the easy-going lack of authority of the home: to ask children or young people to be Christians—or to take their religion seriously—is often to ask them to rebel against their parents.

Toleration and industrialism are two factors which have greatly affected the position of the Church of England: a third is the growth of scientific knowledge and of historical criticism. It is a diffused and popularized scientific knowledge which has made people feel to-day, as in Bishop Butler's time, 'that Christianity is not so much as a subject of inquiry; but that it is, now at length, discovered to be fictitious.' Archbishop Temple once drew attention to the 'perils of a purely scientific education'; but it is not so much scientific *education*, which, if it be sufficiently prolonged, almost invariably induces humility, but rather a scientific smattering, a general confident expectation that anything can be done by electricity, by psychology, by the release of atomic energy, which is inimical to religion.

Two judgments are worthy of quotation. The first is from Professor Leonard Hodgson's inaugural lecture at Oxford, published as *Theology in an Age of Science*: 'A few years ago the headmaster of a public school remarked that whereas in divinity lessons his highly critical pupils would accept nothing that could not be proved to the hilt, in the laboratory they were in a receptive state of mind, prepared to believe in whatever marvels of science might be revealed to them.' This may not be true of all sixth forms: it is certainly true of the temper of the country as a whole. The second is from one of the Secretaries of the Schools Council of the Student Christian Movement. Writing from experience in religious conferences with the sixth forms of boys' and girls' secondary schools he declares that the dominant impression he has received is of the pupils' intense intellectual curiosity, of a critical and inquiring attitude which is the most remarkable achievement of modern secondary education. Everywhere there is the demand for proof: and the visitor from outside has to be patient with his questioners as he raises 'in an elementary fashion the nature of knowledge' and explains that experience of God is 'different from knowledge of things and cannot be proved as a theorem is proved in geometry or demonstrated as a scientific hypothesis is shown to be true.' [2]

A further hindrance to the acceptance of Christianity is the existence of Marxism. For many this has provided an alternative explanation of the nature of things, an alternative cause for which to go on crusade. During the war this was powerfully reinforced by the example of the U.S.S.R. Here was a country which had made Marxism work, as no country had ever made Christianity

[1] *Home and Family Life*, 13.

[2] R. C. Walton, in *Religion in Education*, November 1945.

work. Whether that support will appear as convincing during the present phase of Russian policy remains to be seen. But for a long time, among university students more even than among the almost precociously developed sixth-formers, the choice was one between the creeds of Christ and of Karl Marx.

The Commission's terms of reference were 'to survey the whole problem of modern evangelism, with special reference to the spiritual needs and prevailing intellectual outlook of the non-worshipping members of the community.' The prevailing *intellectual* outlook? One of the chief problems of to-day is that we are living in a mass society, the greater proportion of whose members have no outlook which could be called intellectual at all. (This was one of the reasons which led the Commission to pay careful attention to those experts who spoke to it of modern methods of press publicity. It is not that advertising would be likely to convert any one; but it might unstop men's ears so that they would hear the evangelist's word when it was spoken.) For great numbers of workers in industrial areas life means little more than work, and food, and sex; the pub, the pools, the pictures, and the dogs. Here is the real opium of the masses, producing an indifference to politics quite as much as to religion. One is reminded of the epigram that, in the creation of the *Daily Mail* and the *Daily Mirror* the late Lord Northcliffe had invented two kinds of newspapers, one for those who could read but not think, and another for those who could see but not read. (These were the very people for whom the painted glass of mediæval churches, and the pictures on the walls, told the facts of the Gospel story.) Where there is thought it is often at a crude and superstitious level; and this is true of other classes of the community than the poorest. Mr. Michael Roberts has pointed out that 'in the autumn of 1939, the most widely read book in England was an astrological work called *Hitler's Last Year of Power*.' He also gives these astonishing statistics: 'Between 1871 and 1937 the number of people employed in British education was trebled, but in the same period the number employed in sport and entertainment rose by 2400 per cent.' [1]

It is not by school or church that the values of our people are being set. It is by shop window and hoarding, by the cheaper newspapers and magazines, by the cinema, by the 'light programme' of the B.B.C., only half attended to, but influential none the less. As a writer in the current issue of *The Student Movement* has put it: 'The Bible has played an important part in shaping the life of the British people, whose language, laws, and codes of conduct are penetrated with Christian thought. For many centuries its values were those which influenced ordinary men and women, for there was no source of propaganda so readily available or everywhere acknowledged. Up to the end of the last century it provided the standard and pattern of life to which, even in disobedience, the average man gave assent.' Since then, however, these new rivals have appeared. 'When one considers the poverty of Christian apologetics in comparison with the impact of the cinema, and realizes that any one popular film reaches more people than the Biblical story, one cannot help but be concerned with the values of the film and the influence of the cinema on the community. For those whom we teach, like those we work and live with, are deriving their notion of what *is* from precisely this source.' [2]

What are these values which our society has half-consciously accepted and which these powerful instruments of propaganda are inculcating in each new generation. Many of them are the precise opposite of what the New Testament teaches. Dr. Marjorie Reeves has analysed them as follows:

'(i) The happiest person is he who possesses the most material possessions; the chief satisfaction in life is to get and get more and more; when you've got a bicycle you must have a car, if you've achieved a wireless you must get a gramophone, and then a piano and then maybe another.

'(ii) The law of the world is competition; the only sensible way to act is to get on, to climb up, to push some one else down.

'(iii) Work is a nuisance to be avoided by every device possible; the less work you do the more lucky you are; the farther up the tree you climb the less work you do, whilst the "big toff" at the top of the tree does no work at all.

'(iv) The powers that rule this world—known as "they"—are untrustworthy and arbitrary, to be tricked and outwitted as often as possible, and obeyed as seldom as possible.' [3]

If these are the values which our society is teaching its young, then it is not surprising that there is often a very marked deterioration in character in the early years after boys and girls have left the protected world of school. When we add to this that our country has just emerged from six years of warfare organized on a totalitarian scale, it is not surprising that the Report can speak of 'increased moral depravity.' But many of those who are thus condemned as depraved would be very surprised to find themselves so described. 'I'm about as good as the next man,' they would say, recognizing no external

[1] *The Recovery of the West*, 42, 103.

[2] Vernon Sproxton, in *The Student Movement*, March–April 1946.

[3] *Children of the Future* (Kingsgate Press; 6d.), 5.

standards by which their life might be judged. Morality is ultimately dependent upon belief; where belief has faded immorality invariably increases. But there is no need to dwell upon a state of affairs to which attention is constantly being drawn.

A black picture? Alleviating features could certainly have been shown. There are the men and women returning from the Forces. Some have been hardened in spirit by service; others have been spiritually emancipated. A lack of standards produces in the end its own reaction: signs of that reaction are to be seen in a demand for better films, better plays, better newspapers, even for a weekly edition of *Hansard*. But it is perhaps best to begin with darkness: for if a lamp has been lit it is in the dark that its light is most clearly seen. Christians are not downhearted when they think of the greatness of the task before them. They know that the light shines in darkness and that the darkness is unable to overcome it. They are only downhearted when they think of themselves—that they are such poor light-bearers, that the whole Church to which they belong makes so dim an illumination. There are thinking people who are re-examining the claims of Christianity, wondering whether perhaps in its teaching is to be found the key to the solution of our troubles. In a sense the Education Act of 1945 represents the death-bed repentance of a generation, saying, 'if it be not too late, we will at least have Christianity taught in our schools.' Such people have not usually gone on to think about the Church: and it is a living Church that England needs, a Church which attracts men to its preaching by reason of its practice. In the darkest hours of war our nation was braced for effort because it was told the facts of the situation, and because it faced those facts. Members of the Church of England must be told the facts; and they must face them. But the greatest fact of all is of God revealed in Jesus Christ. It is right that the second chapter of the Report should be headed *The Eternal Gospel*.

Literature.

ISLAM AND CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY.

It is a long time since Ramon Lull acted on his belief that, if Christians and Muslims could only come together, and learn to know each other better, there would be far more likelihood of a reconciliation, and of the spread of truth, than through the wild clashing of the Crusades.

Mr. J. Windrow Sweetman, the Vice-Principal of the Henry Martyn School of Islamic Studies at Aligarh, in India, is of the same opinion and has boldly set himself to carry through a huge and daring project. He is shocked by the ignorance of each other's tenets shown by the adherents of the two faiths. 'In hardly a single book written by a Muslim have we seen a correct appreciation of the theological position of the Christian. The gravest philosophers attack as Christian doctrine beliefs which Christians themselves repudiate.' This he thinks was due not a little to the degenerate Christians with which early Muhammadanism found itself in contact. We are amazed at the travesty of the faith which they, in all seriousness, hand on as an authentic picture of it. But, says our author shrewdly, while they do not know what Christianity is, they may have known what Christianity was, as they saw it held and practised round them. While to-day the pitiful misunderstandings are, he thinks, due very largely to our failure to state Christ's case with any dignity and efficiency. We have pelted them with tracts, often more or less crude, but where are the standard works on Christian doctrine in the languages spoken by Muslims?

Accordingly in *Islam and Christian Theology: A Study of the Interpretation of Theological Ideas in the Two Religions*, in three parts: (I) Origins; (II) Scholastic Development; (III) Critical Reconstruction (Lutterworth Press) he has set forth on an ambitious enterprise indeed, planned on a great scale, and demanding full and detailed knowledge of the literature of both of the religions, such as very few possess. Part I of the first volume, called *Preparatory Historical Survey of the Early Period* (16s. net) has now appeared—at a second venture, for the first MS. was sunk by enemy action. As its title implies, it is a clearing of the ground for what is to follow. But it reveals a fullness of knowledge, a calm of judgment, and an historic sense that make this in itself a most valuable volume, and that are the happiest of auguries for what is still to come. Some indication of the sweep and range of the book may be given by indicating some of the contents: Interrelations of Islam and Christianity; The Evidence of the Qur'an; Worship and Ritual; Doctrine; Religious Law; Christianity and Muslim Tradition; The Christian Theological Background of Islam; Pre-Islamic Christian Controversy; Christian Heresy and Islam; The Apologists and the Chief Points at Issue.

The ignorance is not all on the one side by any means. 'The Christian concludes that Muslim dogmatics are so crude as to be almost negligible.'

To counter that, we have translated for us 'The Shorter Theology of Ibn Miskawaih' (died A.D. 1030) introduced by a striking essay on the Muslims' knowledge of Greek and other philosophers and the like.

All this is well. But the best is to come. The next volume (in the press) is to deal with such topics as the Being and Attributes of God; The Grace of God; Meditation; Logos Doctrine; The Ordering of the Universe; The World and Man; Sin, Salvation, and Judgment.

One wishes Mr. Sweetman all success in his daring adventure, which should be to the benefit of many. A. J. GOSSIP.

HOW DID JESUS THINK OF HIMSELF AND HIS MINISTRY?

The Intention of Jesus (S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net), by Professor John W. Bowman of the Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburg, Pa, is a book to buy and read not once nor twice. Only rarely does a reviewer permit himself to say this, for he knows how widely tastes differ. In the case of this book, however, the exception may safely be made, provided the reader is interested in the question: 'What did Jesus think of Himself and what was the Purpose of His Mission?' Briefly stated, Professor Bowman's thesis, argued with full detail and with competent knowledge, is that Jesus united in Himself the prophetic vocation of the Messiah of the Remnant with that of the Suffering Servant of the Lord, and that, arising out of this unique conception, His intention was to found a Community, the Church. While this thesis is not new to British readers, it would be difficult to name a work in which the theory is presented so clearly, and so convincingly, *as a whole*, especially as regards the idea of the Church as part of the intention of Jesus. The writer is very familiar with recent critical discussions in America, Great Britain, and Continental countries, and treats the relevant problems, particularly that of 'the Son of Man,' with freshness and insight. In his submission the Son of Man came 'to identify himself with sinners with a view to their becoming the new people of God' (p. 176). The treatment of sources is constructive. 'The testimony of our sources,' Professor Bowman writes, 'to this Messiah, Son of God Christology is fairly complete, as every source puts one or the other term upon his lips (and even more convincingly, *as the thought in his innermost consciousness*), at one time or another during his ministry' (p. 125). In reading the work we are reminded constantly of the work of T. W. Manson, to whom Professor Bowman recognizes his indebtedness, and of W. Manson's 'Jesus the Messiah,' a fine book which he does not mention. A special interest belongs to the discussion of the narratives of the Baptism and Temptation. The experience implicit in the Baptism narrative was the prophetic call to turn to God, to make the *moral decision* of standing for the God of Israel. Two themes on which many readers may not be able to follow Professor Bowman's lead are his discussion of Mk 13 and his explanation of the Person of Christ in terms of the phrase 'the spirit of holiness,' but it is almost certain that the Professor himself would concede the inadequacy of this Christology, for he says that a profound identification of will on Jesus' part with that of His Father is the *stuff*, so to speak, out of which 'the spirit of holiness' evolved. We may sum up by saying that it is a long time since we were summoned to such a feast of good things as that provided by this stimulating volume. VINCENT TAYLOR.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE UNITED CHURCH OF CANADA.

See the Christ Stand! (Ryerson Press, Toronto; $3.00) is the vivid and arresting, if somewhat rhetorical, title of a book marking the twentieth anniversary of Church Union in Canada, from the pen of the Rev. Randolph C. Chalmers, Th.D., Associate Secretary, Board of Evangelism and Social Service, the United Church of Canada. Belonging to the Methodist branch of that Church, Dr. Chalmers is one of its younger theologians; and the book now published is a competent and meritorious piece of work, well worthy of the approval it received as a thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Theology of the University of Toronto.

The work falls into three parts. First, there is a survey of the doctrinal heritage of the United Church (Presbyterian, Congregational, Methodist), followed by a study of the Doctrinal Basis of Union. Secondly, there is a survey of the chief trends of theological and metaphysical thought since the Renaissance and Reformation; very useful are the expositions of the New Supernaturalism and Neo-Thomism. Lastly, an effort is made to clarify the present doctrinal situation in the United Church and to point the way of the future. This last is the most ambitious part of the book, and may not commend itself to the United Church as a whole.

Dr. Chalmers tells us that the members of the United Church are not theologically minded, but that there is theological leadership among its ministers. Its theologians may be said to adhere for the most part to the New Supernaturalism. This movement of thought he would distinguish from the Barthian, and he would describe it as orthodox liberalism or progressive conservatism. And he adds, 'This type of theology, an evangelical interpretation of the doctrine of the Word of God, one that is positive instead of negative like Barthianism, that finds natural theology dovetailing into revealed theology and gives primacy to the latter, one that has a place for both reason and revelation and which believes that God's revelation is to be found wherever He has been at work, and supremely in Christ—such is the theology which we believe should be developed in the United Church of Canada.'

Personally I am in full sympathy with such a theological scheme, and I trust power will be given to Dr. Chalmers and others among the younger theologians of the United Church to carry out

the scheme in the years that lie ahead, in face of all the difficulties and complexities of our age.

There is a useful Bibliography; and there are five Appendices, consisting of the more important theological documents to which reference is made in the course of the study.

W. FULTON.

THE GERMANS AND OURSELVES.

The most outstanding feature of this recent brochure by Dr. Karl Barth, *The Germans and Ourselves* (Nisbet; 2s. 6d. net), is the strong evangelical spirit by which it is penetrated throughout. The discussion, brief though it is, is both moving and memorable, and it certainly ought to be read by all who profess and call themselves Christian. It is a deliverance in every way worthy of the author's high reputation. Barth writes as a Swiss, and for the Swiss, but what he says should be deeply pondered by all who are concerned about the future treatment of Germany. The translation, it should be noted, is excellently done by Mr. Ronald Gregor Smith.

Barth begins by remarking that 'it was high time that we felt a deep and serious indignation. But there can be no such righteous wrath upon which we could dare to let the sun go down.' He then proceeds to urge, first, that we retain open-mindedness towards the Germans. 'We should reserve for ourselves the same liberty of outlook in relation to the equally enigmatic problem of Soviet Russia.' 'It is this same open-mindedness which we simply must not abandon now, even in regard to the Germans. There are pessimistic as well as optimistic illusions.' Next he urges that we would do well to survey the stricken German scene at this time 'deeply moved, with sympathy, with awe.' 'In sympathy too? Yes, in sympathy too, for the lightning has struck the earth so near us, and could easily have struck us as well. When we see another broken on the eternal law then something is bound to break in us as well.' This is a note that should surely be emphasized. It is certainly lacking from many of the discussions of the problem we have read. Next he urges that what the Germans need most now is 'quite simply, friends.' They have to see that we are able to answer the question, Who is my neighbour? Perhaps the most moving passage of all is that in which he declares that we have to let them see that by Christianity we mean first the Gospel, and only after that the Law. The Gospel is not for some kind of ideal Germans, but for the real Germans of to-day 'in all the shame of the National-Socialism scourings with which we see them besmeared.' 'For Jesus Christ is also for them, and also unconditionally for them.'

It must not be supposed from the extracts that have been given that there is anything of soft sentimentalism in Barth's approach. The whole is a rich Christian utterance, and a tract for the times to all the churches.

R. J. WEDDERSPOON.

CANADIAN SERMONS.

The Two-Edged Sword, by the Rev. Norman F. Langford (Westminster Press, Philadelphia; $2.00), is a volume of extremely able sermons by a young Canadian scholar and pastor. He has a fluent dignity of style, bright with epigram and antithesis, and a sharp clear mind. These discourses deserve consideration as showing at its best the kind of preaching which comes out of the conservative reaction at present laying hold of so many younger intellects. Much of the book is sheer delight to read, as for instance, 'Simeon was rewarded and more than rewarded at the end of it all by a few minutes' contact with a child too young to speak to him and too helpless to offer any help. This was the consolation of Israel, and Simeon had it. Every Christian has it too so far as he has any knowledge of Jesus Christ. . . . No lifetime, however sad or torn or twisted, is spent in vain if it has had dealings with the things of Jesus. . . . To see Christ is to be glad of life and ready for death.' There is beauty and passion in his use of the old mystical interpretation of the love language of the Song of Solomon. 'The Church fails to-day to take the Song of Solomon seriously as a testimony to God. For the world knows about love in every direction except toward God.' It does seem, however, a failure in reverence for Scripture to choose to base the true and noble things he has here to say on an ancient misconception of Canticles rather than on a sound exegesis of some other convenient passage.

At the same time many who have held views that were advanced in their day will mark with regret a breath of reactionary dogmatism blowing through the lively and attractive pages of this book. It seeks authority in the letter of Scripture and tends to give the Church and Christ the same right to reverence. Clear-cut doctrine is offered as the cure for the sentimental questionings and cravings of the heart. It exercises the cool courage required for personal martyrdom in the contemplation of all human suffering. The glorification of God begins with the vilification of man. It is not the places in Scripture that describe the dealings of God with sinful, erring, tempted men that attract consideration so much as those which contain the verbal implication of some high doctrine. There is little about Galilee in these sermons which expand on Cain and Abel and Noah and the Woman of Samaria. And only about thrice is explicit reference made to the operation of the Holy Spirit.

All conservatism, however sophisticated, is in principle legalism. It wants the gospel, which comes through the lifelong and dying passion of Jesus carved into doctrines and served on a theological plate. 'Where the Spirit is, there is liberty.' To turn away from a humanistic and liberal outlook involves a denial of the Spirit. It is, however, respect and admiration for a very fine piece of work that moves one to enlarge on such criticism.

R. W. STEWART.

O.T. Notes.

Professor Snaith is continuing the valuable series of little books designed to help serious readers of the Old Testament. Two new volumes deal with Amos—*Notes on the Hebrew Text of Amos* (Epworth Press). Part I. *Introduction* (2s. 6d. net), Part II. *Translation and Notes* (4s. net)—and we find in them the qualities for which we have learnt to look in the writer. We have here the usual high standard of scholarship united with notable skill in popular presentation and a deep religious feeling. There are, of course, places where his views would not command the unanimous approval of his brother scholars, for example, in his rejection of certain passages. While the second volume is styled 'Notes on the Hebrew Text,' the actual Hebrew is little in evidence. Hebrew type is not used, and where Professor Snaith feels it necessary to explain textual points, he transliterates. There are few if any notes dealing with philological points, such as those indicated in the S.P.C.K. edition of the Hebrew text. The book is thus almost as useful to the student who knows no Hebrew as it is to one who is reading the book in the original. We may hope to have more of these little books from Professor Snaith, for their value is beyond dispute.

T. H. Robinson.

Biography.

Timothy Richard, by the Rev. E. W. Price Evans, M.A. (Carey Press; 6s. net), is a narrative of both Christian enterprise and Christian statesmanship in China under the inspiration of one of the greatest of Chinese missionaries. Richard worked in no narrow groove. He gave to the Chinese four things they needed—true science, true history, true economics, and true religion. He founded the Shansi Imperial University, he was a pioneer in famine relief work, his missionary work was original and broadminded. And there was ample recognition of his labours and his eminence, not only by Western Universities but by the Chinese Government which conferred on him the rank of Mandarin and ennobled his ancestors for three generations! This is a competent and sympathetic work about one whose contribution to Christian civilization deserves to be worthily commemorated.

Martin Luther: Hitler's Cause—or Cure?, by Mr. Gordon Rupp (Lutterworth Press; 3s. 6d.) is a reply to Peter F. Wiener's book, 'Martin Luther: Hitler's Spiritual Ancestor.' Wiener's facts and fancies made a considerable impression on the mind of the reading public, as reviews by competent persons testify. They showed Luther in anything but a favourable light—not much better than Hitler! And so Mr. Rupp takes Wiener's book and replies to it point by point. He certainly makes a good case and must be taken into account in the summing up.

Lord Shaftesbury: A Portrait, by Florence M. G. Higham (S.C.M.; 6s. net). No better summary of Lord Shaftesbury's life could be found than the words he wrote on his twenty-seventh birthday: 'The first principle God's honour, the second man's happiness, this means prayer and unremitting diligence.' That was his recipe for a good life and he carried it all into practice. He was only fourteen when the sight of social degradation in one case made him resolve to give his life to the poor. And the Shaftesbury Homes, the Thames training ship, the housing estates of which he was the pioneer, the welfare and preventive work, show how fully he made his vow good. A good book.

Eric Liddell: the making of an athlete and the training of a missionary, by the Rev. D. P. Thomson (McCorquodale, Glasgow; 1s. net). Few could read this narrative without being deeply moved and definitely inspired. Liddell was a really great athlete, one of the best three-quarters Scottish Rugby has had and one of the fastest sprinters the track has known. He was also a very devoted Christian, and the story of both sides of his life and activities is told vividly in this pamphlet. It ought to be extended and published in book form. It should have a great run among schoolboys.

The Story of My Life, by Katherine Price Hughes (Epworth Press; 6s. net). Many people will read this because of the author's relation to a well-known religious leader of a past generation. It is the story of a good woman and an active worker in the religious field.

Devotion.

The Guest Chamber, by the Rev. T. G. Edwards, M.A., Honorary Canon of Southwark (Church Book Room Press; 2s. 6d. net), described fitly as 'a companion to the Service of Holy Communion, with suggestions and helps for preparation.' The little book is in two parts: first, an account of the Lord's Supper, what it is, when and how we should approach it, and second, the service itself with explanations at every point. This is an admirable manual for communicants, evangelical, and intelligent. It can be warmly praised.

The Feast of Remembrance, by the Rev. R. J. Smithson, B.Th., Ph.D. (Pickering & Inglis; 2s. 6d. net), has the same object as the book above, mainly exposition and exhortation. The sections are headed, A Holy Festival, Honouring God's Covenant, Observance of Feast, and Inspiration for Service. This also is evangelical in standpoint.

Service Book for Youth, by Mr. J. M. Macdougall Ferguson (Religious Education Press; 10d.). The author of this quite admirable book (sixty pages of unusual value for a few coppers) draws attention to the need of co-operation in worship and gives us in this manual ample material for it. The book is meant chiefly for young people's organisations and includes responsive openings, Bible readings, responsive and choice prayers and litanies. It is prepared to be used in connexion with 'The School Assembly,' a leaders' manual, which has already been noticed in these columns. It would be difficult to praise the *Service Book for Youth* too highly.

The Grace and the Love, by Mr. Harold S. Darby

(Epworth Press; 5s. net). The sub-title is 'A Book of Benediction' which signifies that it is an exposition of the threefold Benediction. There are chapters on grace and on divine love, creating and redeeming, and on matters not directly involved in the Benediction but edifying all the same. People hear the Blessing every Sunday and at every service, and familiarity breeds indifference. There are few parts of divine service so little understood and on which there is so much need of instruction as this. If people realized that this is the preacher's farewell: 'All I have been preaching, may it be yours,' the Blessing would be always a real thing.

The Hymns of Methodism, by the Rev. Henry Bett, M.A., Litt.D. (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net). This book appeared first in 1913. The present (the third) edition has been entirely recast and considerably enlarged as the result of continued study. It is a thorough and authoritative work on the sources, dates, languages, and authors of those hymns which have played such a large part in the worship of the Church. A book which elicits such praise from two such distinguished persons as Dr. Alexander Whyte ('a scholarly and every way delightful book') and Bernard Manning ('Dr. Bett's invaluable book') deserves to go on circulating.

Pearls from the Psalms, by the Rev. J. R. Miller, D.D. (Walter, London; 1s. 6d. net). A text from the psalms and a page of exposition. Good for the quiet hour.

Personal Prayers for All who Serve, by Mr. Donald Dron (Carwal Publications; 9d.). A prayer, a text, and a snatch of poetry for each day. The emphasis is on 'personal.'

My First Praise Book, by Hilda I. Rostron (Religious Education Press; 9d.). A picture on every page and a simple verse of poetry. It succeeds in doing what few can manage—to write simply in words of one syllable and to express thoughts that are just right, and yet neither to be silly nor to be above the toddler's head. And the pictures are delightful.

'A Boy's Voice Flowering.'

An interpretation, from the point of view of the preacher, of the poetry of Sidney Keyes (1922–43).

By the Reverend Ronald W. Thomson, Burton-on-Trent, Staffs.

Sir Walter Raleigh said that he looked to prose to tell him something he did not know before, and to poetry to tell him something he knew already. It was a neat way of expressing the truth that through poetry we learn to look more deeply into the meaning of facts that we already know but cannot interpret, or that it expresses for us our own hidden thought as we could not ourselves have expressed it. Because of this it has also been maintained that to assess the moods and tendencies of an age we need to read the work of its younger poets.

Many of us feel very keenly that we need some help in interpreting the mind of the young men and women who have been through the war. If the gospel is to be presented effectively to the masses of young people who are outside the churches some attempt must be made to estimate the aspirations, fears, and beliefs that motivate them. This is not an easy task, but I believe that Sidney Keyes does express many of the moods of the younger men and women of the war years.

A good deal has been written about our younger poets—and it has not proved easy to judge them. They seem to form no distinct school or group, and many of them have not yet clarified their philosophy. But on the whole we see in them humility, a feeling of guilt, and a realization that man is an imperfect and weak creature. There is little talk of a brave new world, for many of these poets see that the selfishness which compromised the ideals of the past can compromise the hopes men have for the future. Many of them realize that politics are not enough to redeem man, and they feel after something more—some finding that in the Christian faith. All of them cling resolutely to the simple pleasures—love and friendship, and the beauty of the countryside.

Something of this may be seen very clearly in one of the most brilliant of the younger poets, a fallen soldier, Sidney Keyes. He was born in Dartford, Kent, in May 1922. His mother died a few weeks after his birth, and the child was entrusted to his paternal grandparents. The grandfather was one of the most famous millers in the country—the patenter of Daren flour—a tempestuous old man, but a wise one. Sidney was a frail child, obliged to spend much time indoors. This lonely child was therefore forced to create a world of his own, and animals and the heroes of legend became more real to him than his family. At last Sidney was able to go to Dartford Grammar School, and then to Tonbridge School. At this latter school his genius for poetry was encouraged. He was still lonely, with no interest in games or normal boyish pursuits, but he found

a great friend in a master, Mr. Tom Staveley, who was himself a poet of considerable experience and recognized the boy's literary gifts. At sixteen years of age Sidney wrote *Elegy* and *Prospero*, which were symbols of what was to follow. An older poet might well be satisfied with lines such as these from *Prospero* :

> Life's but a summer gnat
> Whiling away its plaintive hour in play,
> But immortality's a frozen flower.

At eighteen years of age Sidney Keyes wrote *The Buzzard* to fill in a blank space in a school magazine ; its intricate scheme so astounded Staveley that he urged Sidney to send it to a London magazine. In his modesty and ignorance he sent it to three different magazines. I have been told that all three at once accepted it, and shy explanations had to follow.

Sidney Keyes went to Oxford, with a scholarship to Queen's, and his two years there were filled with literary activities—he formed a dramatic society, and produced for it a modern morality play which he wrote himself, called *Hosea* ; he edited a volume of eight Oxford poets ; he indulged in a great deal of journalism. By the end of 1941 he had assembled enough poems to form a volume which he entitled *The Iron Laurel*. This volume illustrated his astonishing, and early flowering genius for poetry. His time at Oxford drew to an end ; he entered the army in April 1942, soon joined the Queen's Own Royal West Kent regiment with a commission, and was sent to Africa. He saw only two weeks active service, and died from unknown causes on 29th April 1943, while in enemy hands. He was a month short of twenty-one.

The poems of Sidney Keyes have recently been gathered together in a volume published by Routledge, and called *The Collected Poems of Sidney Keyes*. Everything in the volume proclaims an outstanding poet—the originality of imagery, the mastery of blank verse, the ability to enter into the mind of a character of another century, are all remarkable. Let two illustrations show his ability to paint word pictures :

> These are the presences
> Who sit beyond the gates, their heads as high
> As towers in a dream. . . .

The second illustration comes from a poem on Timoshenko :

> His eyes grew cold as lead.
> Then, in a rage of love and grief and pity
> He made the pencilled map alive with war.

The poetry of Sidney Keyes breathes the dumb courage of his generation, its certainty of death, its feeling of guilt, and its hesitating faith. What he might have become if he had lived is a matter beyond our estimating, although one does wonder if his dormant Christian faith would not have flowered in a wonderful fashion. A very few quotations must be sufficient to show the feelings which he expresses. In his lovely lines to John Clare, for instance, Sidney Keyes expresses his generation's sense of guilt—

> This personal responsibility
> For a whole world's disease that is our nightmare.

He shows youth as feeling lost, and with no hope—

> I see a black time coming, history
> Tending in footnotes our forgotten land.

Elsewhere he says :

> This is my calling, to seek the red rock desert
> And speak for all those who have lost the gardens.

He shares his generation's resentment at the denial of opportunity, but he strikes no note of self-pity—

> If we had met before
> And in another place, what wonder might we see
> Sheltered by days and faces, under a flowering tree.

Or—

> . . . I try to remember how it was
> When lovers sang like finches, and the Word
> Was music.

He is very much obsessed by the thought of pain and death, and yet a hope of immortality shines through—

> Lord . . .
> The quires are dumb. My spirit sings in silence.
> You will appoint the day of my arising.

Or—

> I pass the shining gate
> Into the unknown light
> Of a low sun, knowing that death is conquered :
> For the great have come home, whom all the clamour of history
> Will never deafen or decrease their glory.

He is certain of the final overthrow of evil, as when he writes of the prisoners of Dachau :

> Whatever days, whatever seasons pass,
> The prisoners must stare in pain's white face,
> Until at last the courage they have learned
> Shall burst the walls and overturn the earth.

Sidney Keyes has a hesitant Christian faith, but at times it burns as a clear light in the darkness, as when he sings of John the Baptist :

> I John, not reed but root ;
> Not vested priest nor Saviour but a voice
> Crying daylong like a cricket in the heat,
> Demand your worship. Not of me
> But of the traveller I am calling
> From beyond Jordan and the limestone hills,
> Whose runner and rude servant I am only.
> Not man entirely but God's watchman,
> I dwell among these blistered rocks
> Awaiting the wide dawn, the wonder
> Of His first coming and the Dove's descent.

He conceives Christ's sacrifice as a great challenge to men; in his poem on *The Grail* Sidney Keyes uses the Cup as the symbol of that sacrifice:

> The great Cup tumbled, ringing like a bell
> Thrown down upon the lion-guarded stair
> When the cloud took Him; and its iron voice
> Challenged the King's dead majesty to fear.

As a last example of his Christian faith take the section called *The Lover*, from the poem *Against a Second Coming*. The whole poem is a series of symbolic devices, picturing Christ who has been long away, returning, and finding the house so closed to Him that He can only take it by storm:

> One stands at the door, importunate:
> He brings no lantern and his language late
> For love by some two thousand years
> Beats at our dull accustomed ears.
> One cries, 'Open, house of hate.'
> There is a star in his face,
> Cyclopean searcher of our white disgrace.
> His fingers are candles shining
> Sharper than fear:
> The wind blows through, the kennelled hound is whining.
> One cries, 'Open I am here.'
> His teeth are nails, he's put
> Over the threshold now his iron foot:
> The house is taken by a beggar's ghost.
> The lights burn blue, the watchdog cowers dumb.
> The voice says, 'Your past is lost,
> I have come home.'

To many readers that extract may seem weird, and yet it is not so hard to interpret as much modern poetry. The symbolic devices may be strange—but one of the root ideas is Christ, the Lover, so long kept away from His house that man wishes to keep for ever the house of hate closed against Him.

Sidney Keyes was but, to use his own words,

> A boy's voice flowering out of silence
> Rising through choirs to the ear's whorled shrine
> And living there, a light.

He, however, made articulate many of the feelings of his generation. And those feelings are strangely familiar to the student of history. Here is a description of the world, 'The whole world needed peace, but peace it did not get; one war followed another. . . . We have a world losing population, because men and women were losing heart and hope . . . progressive moral . . . deterioration . . . it has ceased to believe in anything.' These are not extracts from a speech describing to-day, they are Dr. Glover's description of the world into which Christ came, on pages 111, 112, and 114 of his *The World of the New Testament*. That world knew the same sense of frustration, the fear of pain and death, and the hopelessness, of which Keyes sings on behalf of our world. It was precisely to such a situation that the Gospel was first addressed. The ears of our world may be, as Keyes describes them, 'dull accustomed ears,' but we cannot doubt that even in such ears the gospel will yet sound as good news. Keyes says that 'The preacher knows the feel of nails and grace,' he does—but a greater than Keyes said that grace is sufficient, and it saves.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Jumping off Temptation.

By the Reverend John B. Wilson, Glasgow.

'I am the way.'—Jn 14[6].

There is a game which little boys sometimes play; a very foolish and dangerous game. They wait about at tram and bus stops, then when the tram or bus moves off, and if the conductor is not on the platform, they jump on to steal a ride. And they always hope, in fact they always seem to be quite sure, that they will be able to jump off without being caught or before the tram or bus is travelling too quickly for them to risk jumping off. Perhaps their hope is to travel on to the next stop without having to jump off; and they've been heard to boast of the distances they have travelled in this way.

This is the story of a little boy who played that kind of game once too often. He was on his way to school, after dinner one day, and at a busy crossing he saw a bus which had been stopped by the traffic lights. Just as he drew level with the bus the traffic lights changed from red to amber and then to green, and the bus began to move on. The temptation was too much for the little boy and without looking to see if the conductor was safely out of the way, upstairs collecting fares, he jumped on. He grinned mischievously at the passengers inside the bus, and was evidently very pleased with himself. Then the smile suddenly vanished from his face when he saw the conductor

coming downstairs. He made as if to jump off, but the bus was travelling too quickly and he became frightened. So he was caught.

What a row there was. The conductor said that he was 'fed up' with little boys jumping on and off the bus all over the route which he travelled. His nerves, he went on, were all knocked to bits worrying over what would happen to them one of these days. By this time, of course, the little boy was crying and saying that he would be late for school. Some of the passengers entered into the argument; some took the conductor's part and some the little boy's, so that very soon they were all quarrelling with one another. It got so bad that the driver stopped the bus and came round to see what was going on. He supported the conductor and said, 'If the boy wants to travel on the bus, well, he'll travel on the bus all the way to the terminus and back, then he can get off where he jumped on.' And that was that.

That is what temptation does to all of us. 'Only a little,' we say, and, 'Not for very long.' But we can't get off or get out of temptation just whenever we like. It holds us and we discover, when it is too late, that going a little way means having to go all the way; and being sorry for ourselves and crying doesn't help. There are so many ways in which we can be tempted, but for boys and girls temptation very often means just going their own way; saying and doing whatever they want to without thinking; saying and doing the first thing that comes into their heads and taking advice from nobody. You never seem to think of the way you ought to speak or the way you should act. If you did you would not give way to temptation so often, bringing unhappiness not only upon yourselves but upon all those who love you. You need to know the way; and *the way* for you and for all of us is Jesus, Jesus who 'was in all points tempted as we are' but who never gave in. And if you make Him your way, thinking, speaking and acting in His way, temptation may come to you, but you will discover that instead of you giving way to temptation, as usually happened with you, temptation will now give way to you.

Stuck on with Jam.

By the Reverend Derrick Cuthbert, B.A., B.D., Birkdale, Southport.

'And when they could not come nigh unto him for the crowd, they uncovered the roof where he was.'—Mk 2^4 (R.V.).

A friend who is a great railway enthusiast and a collector of railway tickets and labels has told me of an item in his collection of which he is particularly proud. It is an express letter which was sent years ago by the Corringham Railway. The curious thing about it is that instead of the threepenny parcel label which it ought to bear—signifying the threepence fee paid for the delivery of the letter by Express—it has two paper third-class tickets for three-halfpence and these are stuck to the envelope with jam! Evidently on the day when the letter was accepted at the railway station the clerk discovered that the stock of threepenny parcel labels was all used up. What was he to do? The letter must go, and go without delay. The train was due at any moment. Yet something official must be stuck on the envelope to show that the fee had been paid. Suddenly he had an idea. Why not use a couple of three-halfpenny third class tickets? (they were made of paper in those days and not thick cardboard like most tickets to-day). But how to stick them on? There was no paste or glue in the office and no time to send out for some. Good heavens! The train was coming! Then he remembered the café next door. Where there's a café there is usually some jam. Into the café he dashed, begged a little jam, smeared it on the back of his tickets, stuck them on the envelope, and hurried back to the station just in time to meet the train and hand the letter to the guard. In due course the letter reached its destination and the urgent message was received by the one who was anxiously waiting for it. There had been no delay, thanks to sticky jam, and to the fact that the railway clerk refused to be beaten.

A traveller in a remote and mountainous region of America stayed one night in a humble farmhouse where the furniture was very scanty and conditions rather rough. As she went up to bed—her room was a bare little place with a wooden bedstead but very little else—the wife said to her, 'If you find yourself short of anything, let us know; we can show you how to do without it!' A hard life had taught those people how to get along without many of the things city folk regard as absolute necessities. If they did not possess exactly what they wanted, they knew how to contrive a substitute. They knew, as the advertisements say, how to 'make do.'

There is something rather fine about the way these people, and many others, have faced up to shortages and difficulties. Of course, as we are told over and over again, 'There is a right and a wrong way of doing everything,' but the most important matter is that, whatever the way, the thing should be done. Don't become one of those poor creatures who give up trying just because the ideal way—the absolutely correct way—is impossible. If we have the will we shall find a way. And this is true of following Jesus. If we want to know and serve Him, our faith must have determination in it. This was the kind of faith possessed by those four friends of the paralysed man who wanted to bring him to Jesus to be healed, but found that they could not manage to push their way through the crowd at the door. They did not turn away saying, 'What a pity!' or 'Perhaps we had better come to-morrow.' They went up on to the roof and lowered him down from there. When Jesus saw their faith He did not disappoint them. He never does.

It is far better to stick tickets on with jam than not to stick them on at all. Do not allow yourself to be put off by difficulties, especially in your following of Jesus.

The Christian Year.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

Conversion : What It Is.

BY THE REVEREND W. H. MURRAY WALTON,
BROMLEY VICARAGE, KENT.

'Ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God.'—1 Th 1[9].

Some months ago as the result of a broadcast talk I got the following letter :

> 'What do you people all mean ? You say "Let God run your life" ; "Put yourself in God's hands" ; "Hand everything over to Christ"—and quite honestly I do not know what you are talking about. . . . Writers and preachers seem to assume that it is something perfectly easy to do, and also something perfectly comprehensible to the people they are addressing. But I think it is rather like saying to some one who has never piloted a plane : "get into that super-Fortress and fly it to America." . . . I am taking the liberty of writing straight away to ask if you can explain what you all mean, and what are the practical steps to be taken ? How does one begin ? '

It is because of this letter that I have chosen the subject and text which goes at the head of this sermon ; for the word 'turned' is the same as is translated 'converted' in other passages of the New Testament, while the letter in which it occurs was addressed to a group of Christians who had come to know for themselves the experience of conversion. But in answering this question 'What is conversion ?' I want to avoid all the jargon of which the writer of the letter complains, and rather attempt to explain it in the language of to-day. I have an excellent precedent for so doing, inasmuch as our Lord Himself, as we now know, did exactly the same thing.

All life is a matter of relationships ; in business, in social intercourse, in the home, in friendships, we have relations with other people. So big a part do these relationships play that we cannot quite imagine life without them. They are of the very stuff of our daily existence ; they touch life at all points, religious as well as secular. Indeed, religion itself is a matter of relationships.

Now there are many people to whom Christianity is primarily a code of morals. The Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount are religion as they see it. To others again Christianity is summed up by an ideal Life and man's attempt to fashion himself by its standards. But surely both these ideas, noble as they are, are inadequate. For even if religion is defined as no more than man's relation to God, the question of relationships comes right into the centre of the picture at once. It is not merely the following of an abstract code nor the striving after an impossible ideal. But is a relationship between God and man possible ? Here the Christian answers 'Yes' ; for relationships are essentially between persons and by the Incarnation God revealed Himself to man as a person. Indeed, in Jesus Christ His Son we have one who has shared our experiences, who knows our difficulties and limitations, and who by His life among us has given us not only a wholly new conception of what the relationship between God and man is, but also that between man and man. God in Christ as it were offers man the most wonderful friendship imaginable. But here at once we get up against the first snag. For though many men indeed have responded to God's offer, and in doing so have found life's most exhilarating experience, yet more men have found barriers in the way—the 'idols' of which St. Paul speaks. So large a part have these idols come to occupy in their lives that there has been a corresponding impoverishment of the greater friendship. To a man, maybe, it has been his business or his career which has determined all his relationships ; to a woman her home or even her children have become the objects of her worship. Mark, these things are not for one moment necessarily bad in themselves. They may be indeed very good, but what is bad is that men have given them absolute priority, and in consequence the influence of Christ on their lives has been allowed to recede into the background. Something more than an ideal, therefore, is necessary, something which will enable man to get his sense of proportion put right, something, if I may so put it, more than the Incarnation. The example of Christ by itself is not enough.

Here it is that we begin to see the purpose of the Cross. In contrast to our selfishness it represents selflessness raised to an infinite degree. For by His death and His conduct at the time Jesus gave us a perfect example of life lived regardless of self-interest. Not only throughout the whole tragedy was His one thought for others, but more, as an entirely voluntary act, it had the added purpose of making some appeal to the selfish heart of man. To get this appeal across Jesus stopped at nothing, not even the offering of life itself. At the same time the Cross did something else. It showed us in a new light what selfishness, stripped of all its trappings, really is, for it was human selfishness which sent Christ to the Cross. By sheer goodness He had come into the centre of their picture, into that position which the religious leaders had previously secured and held by other means. So Christ had to go ; self could never consent to so easy a displacement. It comes as rather a shock to man when he realizes that the qualities which go to make up the selfishness, he so glibly excuses, can produce such dire results. But the Cross does more ; it shows, at the same time, how intensely God longs for the breaking down of those barriers between Himself and man which man's sins have put up. The fact is that on the Cross God once again takes the initiative as He did before in the Incarnation, and in doing so gives proof of the intensity of His longing for man to return to Himself. He, at all events, is ready to forgive and to restore the broken relationship which man's selfishness had interrupted. But

even this is not all. Jesus did not merely die; 'on the third day God raised him from the dead'—and by that act showed that wrong, with the potency so terrible that it could crucify God, did not in the end have the last word. Love triumphed!

Thus God has done all that He can. Now He awaits our response, wondering whether in face of 'love so amazing, so divine,' we will turn from our old life with its failures and disappointments, and in humble gratitude offer to Him 'our soul, our life, our all.' The taking of this step, my act in response to God's act, is what we call conversion, or, more accurately, the beginning of the converted life. For note how Paul describes it; the turning 'from idols to *serve* the living God.' Paul is very fond of that word 'serve.' He constantly uses it to describe his new relationship to God, not only because he is now God's 'slave' (for that is what the word means literally), but also because God as his Master and Owner is now responsible for him. Conversion is therefore both a momentary act and also the entry upon a life-long experience.

Small wonder then that all the way down the ages men and women have found in this relationship the most transforming experience of life. John Masefield sums it up in his great poem *The Everlasting Mercy* in which Saul Kane after his conversion tries to describe his emotions:

> I did not think, I did not strive,
> The deep peace burnt my me alive;
> The bolted door had broken in,
> I knew that I had done with sin. . . .
> O glory of the lighted mind,
> How dead I'd been, how dumb, how blind.
> The station brook, to my new eyes,
> Was babbling out of Paradise;
> The waters rushing from the rain
> Were singing Christ has risen again.
> I thought all earthly creatures knelt
> From rapture of the joy I felt.

But someone will say, 'Oh yes, but that is all a matter of emotions; I am not made that way. Such an experience is not for a plain undemonstrative matter-of-fact person like myself.' It is important to get this genuine difficulty cleared up; for if any element of mistrust or doubt enters into the relationship between God and man a great deal of the value which may come from it inevitably is lost. The convert finds himself trying to carry on with something less than he is meant to have and consequently ends up by being an ineffective Christian. He has missed the buoyant confidence which such a relationship can mean, and instead wistfully asks himself, 'Is it not presumption on my part to say I know I am a Christian?' Here a little clear thinking can help. Relationships are matters affecting two people at once. If one party is ready to be a friend, whether the friendship eventuates depends on whether the other party is ready to be a friend also. Now there is no doubt as to what is God's attitude on the matter. Has not Jesus Himself said 'Ye are my friends?' There is no uncertainty then in His direction. It must be in ours. Am I, on my part, ready to take the necessary step to turn from idols to serve the living God, and so to order my life that in everything God is absolutely first? The decision rests with me, it is primarily a matter of the will, not of the emotions. If I am ready and do make that response, then I am converted. Emotions can come in afterwards; they are a valuable but not a decisive factor. The vital point is that God has done something and I, in no spirit of pride but with profound gratitude, have done something in response; and so I can humbly say in words which my father wrote:

> I know I have eternal life—
> God's precious gift through His dear Son:
> He faced the foe, He won the strife,
> The work for me is fully done
> But best of all, He's mine!
>
> I know in love He dwells in me
> O, blessed freedom from sin's power!
> His law of life has set me free
> His changeless love keeps every hour—
> But best of all, He's mine!

ROGATION SUNDAY.

The Prevention of a Spiritual Blackout.

'Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.'—Mt 5^{16}.

There were few or no street lamps in London from the fifteenth century till the reign of Queen Anne, and a certain lighting order obtained during that period. The watchman, bearing a halberd and lanthorn, went round the houses in the early evening, beating the doors and ringing his bell and crying from street to street, 'Hang out your lights.' Every house of £10 rental, which fronted a street or lane, was required to hang out a light from the hours of six till eleven o'clock at night during the months of September till March, for the safety of passengers who might meet with foul-play if left in the dark.

Our Lord gave a similar reminder and injunction to His disciples. Aldous Huxley says, 'The majority of civilized men and women are now incapable of living on their own spiritual resources.' There is some truth in this diagnosis of the modern mentality, and too many have no faith and love to illuminate moral values and keep them from flickering out.

> Like tapers, we
> Life's pure wax waste
> Unheedingly
> Till Love, grown weary
> Of its light
> Frowns, puffs its cheek,
> And sighs, good-night.

That is a spiritual blackout, and it must be counteracted. It must be relieved by the illumination of Christian faith and example, which will protect people from the fatalities of the dark.

The ruffian powers of evil will attack, unless the lamp of truth and goodness affords security. Every believing heart is 'a candle of the Lord,' a light which should become more conspicuous when other lights are hidden or quenched. 'Hang out your lights,' for the public safety. Jesus said so, and He never asked anything that was unnecessary. 'Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.'

One of the prime necessities for the public safety is *public worship*. Church-going is a protective illumination of the perilous darkness. Public worship is a proclamation of the God revealed in Jesus Christ, a witness before the eyes of men to the truth that there is no salvation for poor, misguided humans but in Him, and the people 'on the kirkward mile' are a recall to the forgetful, whose forgetfulness is their danger. Church-attendance is thus a service of Christ and a service of those for whom Christ died.

But it is not enough to let men see our good worship for we must also let them see *our good works*, the moral effects, the distinction of faith and character and service, which the good worship has produced in us. What difference has it made in our handling of life? Have we the outlook and spirit of the Beatitudes, the sense of need, the mourning for our defects, the meekness, the hunger for righteousness, the merciful attitude, the pure heart, the will to be peacemakers, the readiness to be persecuted for righteousness sake, all of which Christ envisaged as the Christian temper in action? This is the right direction we are to give strangers by our light. Are we bright examples of how Christ can change human nature and make it so spiritually awake, so discontented with things as they are, so aspiring, so undaunted and ungrudging in devotion to moral values—that it will guide others past the dangers of the dark? Is our attitude so illuminating and inspiring that outsiders to whom the Christian message is very vague, will wish to know our secret and will be attracted to God? 'Hang out your lights,' they are much needed for the public safety.

That means, of course, that people should not pretend to be worse than they are in order to appear rather dashing and ape the fashion of some 'smart set.' They should not hide the faith and ideals in them because it is supposed to be the correct style in some coterie to which they wish to belong. There has been such a revolt against the old-fashioned hypocrisy which pretended to be better than any one could be that there has arisen this new-fashioned hypocrisy which pretends to be worse than one is. If it be said that a man's religion is his own business which he can keep to himself in order to be a good mixer, the reply is that he should be true to the light that Christ has lit in his conscience and show it, and then he cannot be false to any man. Christian truth, as we understand it, may not be the whole truth, our conviction is not an equivalent of the big reality of God, but it is a gleam from His light which shines in the darkness, and the darkness does not swallow it up. Because of its origin, we should not be shy about showing it, much less should we make excuses for believing and serving it, but we should honour it by revealing it in word and action.

Sometimes the most telling witness to Christ is a silent adherence to Him without any words of explanation. There may be a sort of company in which it would be irreverent to speak of religion, because such speech would only expose religion to ridicule and provoke blasphemous sentiments. That would be giving an opportunity of putting Christ to shame and causing others to sin. In such an atmosphere spiritual talk will not get across, but a straight talk will, and while the one might be scouted as ostentation the other will be a convincing piece of obedience. The Christian example will be respected and will have effect as a guiding lamp in the dark. But whenever there is a hint of spiritual search in the eye or tone of another, give the lead he is looking for in the treacherous roads of experience. Christian truth as expressed by those who have discovered its value by experiment and endeavour is fresh. It is new, because they have found it out in their own way and clothed it with their own struggles and songs.

But can this sort of thing not be overdone and lead to an unwelcome and even unwholesome display? The one who sets out with the intention of being an example to his time and piercing the darkness around him with Christian light is tempted to profess too much and to be a little artificial in his character. What is commonly dubbed hypocrisy may often be an excited goodness, a strained attempt to be exemplary and to give a very definite and emphatic lead to others. This anxiety as to how to guide outsiders is relieved by Christ. Think for a moment of His example and it will cure any overdone earnestness. Our Lord never looked like one who was trying to be impressive. There was no grand pose about Him, no excessive air of solemnity. His calm dependence on God kept Him genuine, natural, real. Yet every one who came into touch with Him felt He was something exceptional, because there was a simple supremacy about Him that could not be missed. Thus what we are in ourselves comes out, and we cannot help having an influence, because character has a self-revealing quality, and tells its secret unknown to us.

The result of this will be that many will have a new experience of God and will discover that He is a Father who has not overlooked their need, but has surrounded them with enlightening and inspiring influences. They will find out that God has taken care of them, and come near to them by lighting guiding and protective lamps in the dark, and revealed His love for them through the Christian example of neighbour or friend.

It was the watchman in the London of long ago that went round the houses at dusk, beating the doors and ringing his bell, and crying from street to street, 'Hang out your lights.' To-day, it is Christ Himself that knocks at our door and bids us show some bright lamp of faith and love which will put people in communication with God and

give them experience of His rescuing and directing power. It is His purpose to prevent the deadly peril that would menace the future if the lights were put out in the soul of humanity. 'Hang out your lights'—it is well worth the trouble, because it is a measure for the public safety and for the vindication and triumph of God in our time, if it may be, and if not, in times to come.[1]

SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION DAY.

Why We Hold to Prayer.

BY THE REVEREND GEORGE JOHNSTONE JEFFREY, D.D., GLASGOW.

'Never give up prayer.'—1 Th 5[17] (Moffatt).

There is a passage in Vera Brittain's 'Testament of Youth' which describes a not uncommon experience regarding the practice of prayer. She tells how she prayed earnestly, as a girl in her teens, that King Edward VII. might recover from his dangerous illness. 'The fact that he did recover, established in me a touching faith in the efficacy of prayer, which superstitiously survived, until the Great War proved to me, once for all, *that there was nothing in it.*' And so with a wave of the hand she brushed aside, as patent futility, all the piety and devotion that have gone to the moulding of the saints of all time. Surely the last word is not here.

In another book, akin in title, but worlds removed in spirit, Thomas R. Kelly's 'Testament of Devotion,' the writer, without comment, sets down three of the outsider's objections to prayer. Let us follow out their implications and try to answer them.

The first is that *prayer is 'a mere vestige of superstition.'* That is a common view. 'An educated man outgrows it. We live under categories of cause and effect. Science has taught us that this is a world of rigid law in which prayer is ruled out as an outdated superstition. Doubtless such superstition dies hard. It lingers in the churches to this day where we see countless half-convinced people clinging precariously to their church membership by a dubious attendance only at Communion or on some day of national deliverance.' Thus far the natural man.

To take these last charges. It is quite true that any minister, who takes his work seriously, laments the fact that he sees such members only on these special occasions. But with experience, does he not look beneath the surface and detect symptoms that are not without hope? What if such attendance at Communion does not indicate, however faintly, a wistful hunger and thirst after the living God, a tremulous fear lest the one thing that gives any meaning to this strange life of ours should die out for ever? And what is the attendance of one we might set down as a mere worldling, at a Day of Remembrance and Thanksgiving, but a tacit evidence that behind all we owe to our gallant dead, the supreme issues of the war were in the keeping of an Eternal God? Mingled as such practices might be with superstition, were they not, after all, grounded on reality? Jesus Christ did not despise the plea of the suffering woman though it was coloured by superstition. The fact is, prayer arises deep and spontaneous from the heart of man as man, from man as God has made him.

> We believe, that in all ages
> Every human heart is human,
> That in even savage bosoms
> There are longings, yearnings, strivings
> For the good they comprehend not,
> That the feeble hands and helpless,
> Groping blindly in the darkness,
> Touch God's right hand in that darkness
> And are lifted up and strengthened.

We Christians believe that prayer is a God implanted instinct. So far from reducing that instinct to atrophy by disuse, we intend to hold to it.

The second objection is that *prayer is 'a mere luxury in life.'* A cynic lately defined prayer as 'What bath salts or fine engravings would be to a man in the trenches. Thousands do without it and manage fairly well.'

It is quite true that thousands never enter a house of prayer. But does that mean that they never pray? Sooner or later this life of ours beats a man to his knees. The man who denies that, is talking the language of dishonesty. There is a very human text in the Psalms which reads, 'I found trouble and sorrow—then (though not till then) I called on the name of the Lord.' The French have a saying, 'If you want to believe in God, go to sea.' And what is this life of ours—especially in these war years and their precarious aftermath, but a great, heaving, terrifying sea wherein the hearts of the stoutest have often quailed for fear? The shallowest worldling who saw his boy off at the station on his way to all the grim possibilities of war—did he not pray, though his lips never moved? Prayer a mere luxury in a world like this! We refuse to believe it. Moreover the true Christian does not wait for calamity to drive him to prayer. Sheer gratitude for God's goodness and mercy strewn all over the years—that keeps him daily in the place of prayer. Says George Meredith, 'For this reason so many fall from grace that they cling to God with their weakness and not with their strength.' The God we Christians worship is not the God of the desperate emergency only. He is the God of the common day. We run to Him not only like terrified children in the dark. We keep step with Him gratefully in the light.

Lastly, *prayer is only for people of a special temperament.* 'Listen to this specious pleading.' Of prayer, I can only say, 'For those who like this kind of thing, this is the kind of thing they like. I am not made that way. I never soar into the heavens. My feet are firmly planted on the ground, an ordinary man among ordinary men. No mystic. As there are folks who are musically gifted, and others who are artistically gifted so there are men who are spiritually gifted. I am not one of these. I pray thee have me excused.'

[1] A. A. Cowan, *Captain of the Storm*, 92.

It all seems so plausible. One would even grant there was a modicum of truth hidden under its fallacies. But the answer is plain. *Temperament is only a superficial part of our nature.* Deep down we are all the same. 'An ordinary man among ordinary men.' Christ never met an ordinary man. When this war is well over we shall need to be careful. That 'very ordinary man' on the other side of the compartment, dressed, and only too pleased to be dressed, once more in civilian garb, may turn out to be a V.C.! Christ did not need lessons like these. He knew—it takes *us* so long to learn—that in the breast of the common man there goes on an intense spiritual drama, a ceaseless warfare from which there is no demobilisation, that in the depths of his heart there is an abysmal loneliness, that every man comes fresh to life, loves as if no man had ever loved before, is tempted in an eerie loneliness of heart as if no man but himself ever knew temptation, and one day will die alone. That is man as God has made him, irrespective of his temperament. Strange to hear a man like H. G. Wells speaking, I am sure wistfully, of 'the God-shaped blank in the human heart.' And as long as we remember how God has fashioned us, setting us in a world teeming with zest and interest and delight, yet with the ever remaining 'aching void,' with our feet on the ground, yet with our citizenship in heaven, living on bread, but not on bread alone, we shall bow the knee in the act of prayer.

WHITSUNDAY.

The Tides of the Spirit.

BY THE REVEREND PHILIP W. LILLEY, M.A., RHU, DUMBARTONSHIRE.

'Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear.'—Ac 2^{33}.

Let us try to realize as vividly as we can what exactly happened in old Jerusalem on that first Pentecost. We shall imagine that the disciples of Jesus were gathered together on the flat roof of a house in that city where a few days before their Lord had been crucified. They were humbly expectant of great things. Then the wonderful phenomenon appeared. A noise like a strong wind was heard; light began to play on their heads. The light looked like fire, dividing and turning round. 'It sat upon each of them.' Then the narrative goes on to say that 'they were all filled with the Holy Spirit.' It was a scene of great enthusiasm. The Christians shouted aloud for joy; they sang and cheered, they all spoke at once. These people were full of life and high spirits, so much so that the crowd which gathered in the narrow street outside said that they had been drinking too much. Meanwhile the disciples crowded to the parapet which ran round the roof and their voices were carried down the street. The bystanders were amazed and perplexed.

Then another thing happened. While the onlookers gazed up asking questions, Peter stood forward with the other apostles. The tumult in the street below died down. He began to address them in eloquent words. The speech he delivered was full of confidence and courage and was, above all, suffused with overwhelmingly divine power. It was the first defence of the Christian faith. With passionate conviction he explained what had happened and called upon them to repent of their sins and be baptized. The result was a deep awakening and no less than three thousand souls were added to the infant Church.

Peter flung out a ringing challenge to the men who had crucified Jesus and told them that God had overturned their infamous verdict upon Him through His vindication of His Son. God's answer is something which still speaks to us all to-day. Peter's interpretation of it is still the central message of Christianity, as it was also the burden of all Apostolic preaching.

Let us ponder it now. 'Having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath poured forth this, which ye see and hear.' God by His almighty power had exalted Jesus to heaven and the risen and exalted Saviour had poured out His Spirit upon His friends, and they had received Him as an indwelling Presence and Power. This complete liberation from fear, this exhilarating joy and thanksgiving are His Church's everlasting testimony to the reality of fellowship with its Lord, once crucified, now ascended and victorious, who has given Himself as a gift for all men everywhere. It was this experience which made the Early Church invincible and untiring in its proclamation of the Evangel.

This, then, is central and essential for the Faith. Men have tried to express it as Fire, Light, Dew, and the Dove. What has been 'poured forth' suggested to me the way in which the sea touches the land. Let us then think of the Holy Spirit as the tide of the sea. Let us think of 'the tide of the Holy Spirit.'

First, then, *the tide invades the land.* Those who live by the seaside are familiar with the scene. This is a great unchanging law of Nature. In his delicately suggestive novel, *The Voyage*, Mr. Charles Morgan has made deft use of the figure of the harbour and the sea to set forth the spiritual experience of men. He pictures the type of mind which refuses to believe that God's spirit can really act upon men's minds and hearts. He expresses this all too prevalent sceptical attitude through the conversation of some of his characters. One of them says: 'It's as if they were living in an enclosed harbour and had forgotten the sea outside. One day the sea flows in strongly; there is an exceptional tide and one says that "it's impossible," that "it isn't true," and the other throws up her hands and says—"It's a stroke of magic." Both forget the sea outside and that it is always there and always connected with the water in the harbour and some try to shut out the sea and pretend that there is only the harbour. It is God's mercy that the sea breaks in or the water in the harbour would stagnate.'

All of this seemed to me to be illuminating.

We can 'grieve the Holy Spirit' by sheer unbelief. We can 'do despite to the Spirit of grace.' But the authentic Pentecostal experience is the direct contradiction of all this denial and this unwillingness to see and hear the wonderful works of God. It is the mercy of God that 'the sea breaks in' and that His Spirit is beating up against the shore of every human life. If 'the harbour' be accepted for the moment as a fairly accurate picture of human life, with all the limitations that we know so well, yet even the harbour may be the receptacle into which the Divine life may pour. The harbour may be, so to speak, aware of the sea.

Second, the tide of the sea suggests to us also *cleansing and purification.* We have seen those old harbours. Very quaint and picturesque they are, yet they are not always a pretty sight. They are so apt to collect pollution when the tide recedes. But then the tide does not leave them alone, but rushing in with its clean salt baptism cleanses them through and through. The flotsam and jetsam, the green slime and the driftwood are carried out into the abysmal depths of the vast ocean and are seen no more. John Keats in a very haunting couplet expressed this cleansing process :

> The moving waters at their priestlike task
> Of pure ablution round earth's human shores.

Truly our poor world is in a state of sad defilement through the sins of men. But God's spirit is still mercifully laving the world of to-day and the freshening current of His Divine life will never ebb away.

So also is the individual cleansed and purified. The heart of a man can be changed from being a stagnant pool in which all manner of noxious infections breed into a river of pure water, flowing out in acts of devotion and ever replenished with new supplies from the great mountains of God. The love of God, says Paul, is shed abroad through His Holy Spirit which floods the hearts of men. But this never happens automatically ; it is all conditioned by a sincere repentance which issues in loyal obedience to the guidance of the Spirit.

Finally, the tide of the sea speaks of *boundless and irresistible power.* The Jews had a horror of the sea. Ps 108 expresses the sense of man's perennial helplessness when the wind in its fury lifts up the huge dark masses of water. In his address to the sea, Lord Byron has depicted its strength and easy mastery over man's greatest naval achievements.

> The oak leviathans, whose huge ribs make
> Their clay creator the vain title take
> Of lord of thee, and arbiter of war—
> These are thy toys, and, as the snowy flake.
> They melt into thy yeast of waves, which mar
> Alike the Armada's pride or spoils of Trafalgar.

But remember that the sea also sustains and bears on its broad bosom the great vessels which ply from shore to shore. The sea can empower, if its strength is harnessed for the well-being of humanity. Dr. Fosdick tells how in one of the tidal rivers near New York the building of a bridge was interrupted by a derelict sunk in the river's bottom. Divers put chains about the obstacle and all day long the engineer directed the manœuvring of tugs as they puffed and pulled in vain endeavour to dislodge the hulk. Just then a young student made the suggestion that, when the tide was out, the flat-bottomed boats which had just arrived should be fastened to the derelict. The Atlantic began to come in ; its mighty shoulders underneath the boats lifted, lifted until the derelict had to come. The youth had harnessed the infinite energy of the ocean to his task.

It is an apt enough illustration of the infinite reserves of power that are available for those who earnestly seek them. It reminds us too of the pathetic failure of those who attempt in their own puny strength things which only God can enable them to do. In the Church to-day there are thousands of spiritually enervated men and women ; thousands, too, of ministers who know that they have failed desperately because they have worked the moral machinery of their churches to breaking point. But, if we were to realize our boundless reserves, we should not be tired as we undoubtedly are. We are tired, as Professor T. E. Jessop puts it, 'when we ought to be seizing our grandest opportunity and startling the exhausted world with our humanly inexplicable vitality.' But how shall we gain that vitality and renewal ? In this way.

Our children go down to the seaside and enjoy making a large hollow in the sand as the tide races in towards the land, and wait in expectation. They appropriate some of the sea because they have made a place in which to receive it. There is no more water in the sea than there was the day before. In like manner at Pentecost there was no more Holy Spirit in the world than there had been before, but there *was* more for the humble, prayerful, receptive hearts of the believers. So it always is.

> He came sweet influence to impart,
> A gracious, willing guest,
> While He can find one humble heart
> Wherein to rest.

It is no vague excitement that He brings ; the joy and freedom and power that are made manifest are the token that Jesus is there in His Divine spirit and thus our natural faculties and powers are raised and reinforced by Power Divine. Still does He bestow liberally upon His Church. Still does He say, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost.'

Displacements in the Fourth Gospel.

By F. J. Brown, C.B., C.B.E., M.A., B.Sc., London.

While there is general agreement among New Testament students that disarrangements have occurred in our Fourth Gospel, there is much disagreement as to where, precisely, they are to be found. The latest worker in this field, F. R. Hoare, for instance, finds disarrangements where no one else has found them, and refuses to admit disarrangements which many have thought obvious.[1]

Mr. Hoare is a Roman Catholic, and his book—*The Original Order and Chapters of St. John's Gospel*—bears the imprimatur of his Church. Like Warburton Lewis, and Spitta before him, Mr. Hoare believes strongly that an arithmetical test should be applied to all attempted reconstructions. He assumes, like Mr. Lewis, that the disorder arose accidentally among the pages of the first fair copy of the Gospel, before they had been fastened together; and that the author was not then available to assist his amanuensis in restoring the proper order. He further assumes, on the basis of generally agreed displacements, and of textual evidence too complicated for discussion here, that the average number of letters on each page was about 397, in 21 lines. No passage should, he thinks, be assumed to be displaced unless it roughly represents this number of Greek letters, or a multiple thereof; while a similar test should be applied to the passages *between* those assumed to be displaced. This seems pretty rigorous; but Mr. Hoare makes it more elastic by admitting the possibility of textual variations; and especially by assuming that the original text was divided into chapters (different from ours), and that a space of about four lines was left blank between the chapters. His attempt to reproduce this original division is not convincing; and, even if it were, such a method of spacing would reduce the arithmetical test to a rough approximation only. Mr. Lewis seems to assume an average of about 385 letters per page, which is near enough to Mr. Hoare's figure.

But do not such attempts at arithmetical tests assume too much? Is it not a large assumption that the disorder occurred in a *fair* copy of the text? It may just as easily have occurred in the rough notes of the amanuensis, in which case it would be vain to expect uniformity in the disordered pages.

The first readjustment that Mr. Hoare proposes—one peculiar to himself—is to place the bulk of ch. 4 immediately after ch. 1. He starts with 4^{3b} ('And He departed to Galilee'), following on the decision mentioned in 1^{43}; and continues to 4^{43} ('After the two days [at Sychar] He went forth thence to Galilee'). He then reverts to 2^{1} ('And on the third day there was a wedding in Cana of Galilee'). One thinks that Mr. Hoare has been misled by the too facile sequence—'After the two days' and 'on the third day.' He explains that on the Jewish reckoning the 'two days' may have been much less than 48 hours, and may have left 36 hours or more for the journey of about 40 miles from Sychar to Cana. But this seems like special pleading. He would be on stronger ground if he abandoned the superficially attractive sequence, and reckoned the 'third day' as from the end of the 'two days.' But there seems to be a stronger objection to placing the journey through Samaria immediately after ch. 1. In 1^{43} ἐκεῖ should probably be substituted for καί—a substitution which Moffatt apparently accepts. (The error καί for ἐκεῖ would be a very natural one, especially in dictation; and has probably occurred also in 7^{3}, where ἵνα ἐκεῖ seems to be a much more likely reading than ἵνα καί.) If this is so, Jesus would already be in Galilee at the end of ch. 1—a conclusion confirmed by the words addressed to Nathanael: the 'fig-tree' suggests a secluded place in his own garden at Cana (for he was of Cana (see 21^{2})).

This is not to say that the wedding at Cana may not have followed the journey through Samaria at a later stage. In other words, it may be that 2^{1-11} should follow 4^{45}. But in that case 4^{46} (which may be editorial) would have to be omitted; for Jesus, we may assume, would still be at Cana when the second miracle (4^{47-54}) occurred.

Having inserted 4^{3b-43} between 1^{51} and 2^{1}, Mr. Hoare makes no further alteration in the first four chapters. The effect is that 4^{3a} immediately precedes 4^{44}. He rather prides himself on this conjunction, which, he thinks, removes the difficulty of the reference in 4^{44} to a prophet having no honour in his own country, for we now read: 'He left Judæa, for Jesus Himself bore witness,' etc. It has, of course, often been suggested that πατρίς in this connexion means Judæa, but this is apparently the first textual reconstruction that

[1] A summary of the conclusions of the principal previous workers appears in Dr. Howard's *Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism*, p. 264. Dr. Howard himself seems to agree generally with Mr. Warburton Lewis. He strongly favours an arithmetical test.

would make this clear. It still remains true, however, that Judæa was *not* the πατρίς of Jesus of Nazareth. The difficulty would be solved if the Johannine statement could be brought into conjunction with the removal from Nazareth to Capernaum mentioned in 2^{12} (compare Mt 4^{13}), but this hardly seems to be possible. Failing this, would it be too far-fetched to suggest that αὐτὸς γάρ (the first words of 4^{44}) are a primitive error for καίτοιγε? The words being written in uncials without break, the difference might not be too great. The sense would of course be: 'He went thence to Galilee, although Jesus bore witness,' etc. (compare 4^{2}, where καίτοιγε is used, and note that we have καὶ αὐτοὶ γάρ in *v.*^{45}).

In connexion with some of these suggestions, we must consider 4^{54}. The meaning of the verse is a little uncertain. It harks back, undoubtedly, to 2^{11}: 'Jesus again did this second sign, having come out of Judæa into Galilee,' as He did the 'beginning of signs in Cana.' The point is not, I think, that He did the second sign, like the first, having completed a journey from Judæa to Galilee, but rather that this was the second sign which He did in Galilee. If both signs were done after the journey through Samaria (*i.e.*, if 2^{1-11} were placed between 4^{45} and 4^{47}, *v.*^{46} being omitted) the relevancy of *v.*^{54} would be still more obvious.

But the verse admits of another interpretation, namely, that the healing of the 'nobleman's' boy was (absolutely) the second sign that Jesus did, and that He did it after He came from Judæa to Galilee. This would mean, of course, that Jesus had—so far—done no miracles at Jerusalem, and that the references in 2^{23} and 4^{45} to unspecified signs there were due to a redactor's misunderstanding. It seems unnecessary to go so far. (Nicodemus's reference to signs would not be similarly affected, for it may be that his conversation with Jesus occurred later in the Ministry.)

Mr. Hoare, curiously, sees no need for any change in ch. 3; whereas the first change made by Mr. Lewis and Dr. Moffatt is to transfer 3^{22-30}, so as to follow 2^{12}—*i.e.*, to place our Lord's baptismal mission in Judæa soon after the removal to Capernaum. The passage 3^{31-36} is thus brought into direct sequence with the Nicodemus narrative, to which, as most students will agree, it belongs. Mr. Hoare regards it as a comment on the Baptist's words, 3^{27-30}.

But, while 3^{22-30} seems out of place where it is, need we remove it so far back as 2^{12}? Might it not suffice if 3^{22-30} and 3^{31-36} simply changed places, as Bernard and Macgregor propose? The former passage would then immediately precede $4^{1.2}$, which tells of the cessation of the baptismal mission and the departure for Galilee. Incidentally, $4^{1.2}$ bears traces of a redactor's hand—a thing inherently probable where disruption has occurred. This change would avoid the slight linguistic difficulty involved in the transfer of 3^{22-30} to 2^{12}—namely, that μετὰ τοῦτο would be followed twenty words later by μετὰ ταῦτα.

It seems obvious that this return to Galilee was something of an event; and it is reasonable to identify it with our Lord's coming to Galilee at the beginning of His public Ministry there, on which the Synoptists lay such stress. The arrest of the Baptist no doubt occurred about the same time. The Temptation may quite well have taken place while His disciples were baptising, for the scene was near the Judæan desert.

It is strange that most of those who accept the displacement theory refuse to admit that the story of the Cleansing of the Temple has been displaced, although it is of the standard length, and although a place seems to be waiting for it just after 12^{19}. (G. P. Lewis is an exception. See Howard's *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 140 and 264.) Perhaps they think that this would be too easy a solution of the age-long difficulty that the Fourth Gospel placed this event at the beginning of the Ministry and the Synoptists at the end. Or perhaps they are loath to give up the idea that the 'forty-six years' of 2^{20} marks a definite date. This is not the place to discuss the point; but it may be remarked that the question seems to turn on whether ᾠκοδομήθη has the *completed* sense which the R.V. gives it, or the *continuous* sense ('has been in course of construction') which is possible in Hellenistic Greek. In the former case there is no definite date; in the latter case the date of the incident would be fixed at about A.D. 27. But it is unfair to support this latter interpretation by the legend that the Temple was continuously in course of construction from 19 B.C. to A.D. 64. Josephus is our only authority, and he says nothing of the sort (see *Ant.* xv. $11^{3.5.6}$, xvii. 10^{2}, and xx. 9^{7}.

Having examined these schemes of reconstruction up to the end of ch. 4, one may perhaps ask whether any other reconstruction is possible. With all diffidence, the following is suggested:

Ch. 1 as it stands, with the omission of *v.*^{15} (an obvious interpolation), and with the substitution of ἐκεῖ for καί in *v.*^{43};
Ch. 2 as it stands, with the omission of *vv.*$^{14-22}$ (transferred to follow 12^{19}), and the omission of ἐν τῷ πασχα, ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, in *v.*^{23};
Ch. 3 as it stands up to and including *v.*^{21}, continuing with *vv.*$^{31-36}$, followed by $^{22-30}$;
Ch. 4 as it stands, with the possible substitution of καίτοιγε for αὐτὸς γάρ in *v.*^{44}. (*Vv.*$^{1.45}$ show signs of redaction, but no alteration is suggested.)

Mr. Hoare—again rather remarkably—will not accept the transposition of chs. 5 and 6, a change which Mr. Lewis puts in the forefront of his proposals, which Archbishop Temple—'against a strong initial prejudice'—considered necessary, and which two of our ablest commentators—Bernard and Lagrange—whole-heartedly adopt. The position is usually stated thus: at the end of ch. 4 our Lord is in Galilee, apparently beginning a Ministry there; in 5^{1} He goes up to Jerusalem, where He remains throughout the chapter; and then, without any intimation of His return to Galilee, in 6^{1} He departs to the other side of the Lake of Galilee. Perhaps the relation of the end of ch. 4 to the beginning of ch. 6 may be expressed still more forcibly: in the former Jesus has just done His first miracle of healing in Galilee; in the latter the Evangelist makes his only other reference to the Galilean Ministry of healing—'a great multitude followed Him, because they were witnessing the signs which He did upon the sick.' Another reason for the transposition is that much of the subject-matter of ch. 7 relates to that of 5 and not to that of 6. Mr. Hoare thinks that the only change necessary in this connexion is to make 7^{15-24} follow immediately after 5—a change in which practically all who believe in the dislocation theory concur. Ch. 5 ends with the words: 'If ye do not believe in his (Moses's) writings (*γράμμασιν*) how will ye believe My words?' To this, the remark of the Jews in 7^{15}: 'How has this man any knowledge of writings (*γράμματα*)' is a natural sequence. Moreover, *vv.*[20. 23] refer back in an entirely natural way to the cause of the dispute; while—*vv.*[15-24] being removed—the rest of ch. 7 follows quite appropriately on *v.*[14]. Mr. Lewis thinks that 8^{12-20} should also be transferred to ch. 5, following on 7^{15-24}, but this seems much more doubtful.

Mr. Hoare of course omits the 'pericope' about the woman taken in adultery. His next change—another peculiar to himself—is at 8^{28}. In the middle of this verse he inserts the long passage 12^{34-50}, his main reason for so doing being that the transposition explains the questions asked in 12^{34}—'How sayest thou, The Son of man must be lifted up?' and 'Who is this Son of man?' In the present setting, Jesus has just spoken of His being 'lifted up,' but has not called Himself the Son of man; in the new setting He has spoken of the 'Son of man being lifted up.' But Mr. Hoare is surely wrong in including 12^{37-43} (the comments on the crisis of the Ministry) in the transfer, for this passage clearly belongs to the closing stages.

His next two proposals also seem quite unacceptable. One is to insert 12^{23b-33} between *vv.*[33. 34] of ch. 11; the other is to transfer 10^{1-18} so as to follow 12^{23a}. They seem to be based on the idea that 12^{23b-33} is not quite appropriate as addressed to the Greeks who had asked to see Jesus, and that the passage about the Door and the Good Shepherd would be more appropriate. Few will follow this reasoning. The only message in the latter passage which seems to apply specially to Gentiles is 10^{16}; and this is no more appropriate than 12^{32}; while the insertion in ch. 11 of the passage from 12 only tends to spoil the inimitable beauty of the story of Lazarus. Mr. Lewis's only proposal concerning the chapters in question is that 10^{19-29} should change places with 10^{1-18}—a proposal adopted by Dr. Moffatt.

We now come to those intimate and tender chs. 13–16, where it almost seems like sacrilege to attempt any reconstruction. The strongest argument that dislocation has occurred here lies in the closing words of ch. 14: 'I shall no longer talk much with you' and 'Arise, let us go hence.' The latter words appear to mark the end of the discourse; while the former would hardly apply if the words of 15 and 16 were still to be spoken. There are other words which seem to be a little out of place in their present setting. So much is generally agreed; but there is considerable disagreement as to how the disorder should be remedied.

Let us start with the suggestions of Mr. Hoare, who affirms that in making them he has applied his arithmetical tests with great strictness. We need not follow him in detail; enough to say that, after his reconstruction, the chapters would stand thus: 13^{1-19}, 15^{17}–16^{4a}, 13^{20-38}, 14^{1-14}, 16^{15b-23}, 14^{15-24a}, 16^{4b-15a}, 14^{24b-31}, 15^{1-16}, 16^{24-33}. Most readers will think that this is rearrangement run mad! One advantage might possibly be that it places the warning about persecution in the first part of the discourse, and thus brings the Fourth Gospel a little nearer the Synoptists, who include it in the eschatological discourse. There is no need to suppose that the whole of these chapters were spoken on one occasion.

Mr. Lewis's scheme is much simpler. He inserts chs. 15 and 16 between *vv.* [32. 33] of 13; places the remaining verses of 13 after 16; and ends the discourse with 14. Dr. Moffatt inserts chs. 15 and 16 after the first words of 13^{31}—'When therefore he went out, Jesus saith, "I am the true vine"', etc., while his commentator, Dr. Macgregor, would insert them after 13^{35}.

I cannot think any of these proposals satisfactory. The words, 'Arise, let us go hence,' and those just before them, certainly suggest that this should be the end of the discourse; but it is much less certain that the greater part of ch. 14 should be placed near the end. If we consider the various references to the Paraclete, we must, I think,

conclude that the earliest is that at $14^{16.17}$—'I will ask the Father, and He will give you another Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth.' The other references all seem to assume some such declaration as this. Moreover, it is difficult to see how Thomas could have uttered the complaint of 14^{5} if the disciples had just joined in the expression of enlightenment of $16^{29.30}$.

And while there may be ground for thinking, as Mr. Lewis and others do, that the allegory of the vine has some reference to the excision of Judas from the fellowship, I doubt whether this justifies the transfer of the whole of ch. 15 to the beginning of the discourse. After all, the burden of the allegory is not the fate of the withered branch, but the glory of the living and fruitful branches.

Apart, therefore, from 13^{36-38}, the case would probably be met if we left the whole of these chapters as they are, with one exception, namely, the transfer of the last paragraph of ch. 14 (*vv.*$^{25-31}$) to the end of 16. This was the solution favoured by Streeter. We should resume, in these verses, the thought of the Lord's peace, referred to in 16^{33}; we should again be reminded of the difference between His giving and the world's; and we should again hear His exhortation to courage. The transfer would apparently do no violence to the arithmetical tests of our authorities.

It only remains to find a place for 13^{36-38}, if we do not leave the passage where it is. Mr. Hoare leaves it in its present position relatively to its immediate context. Mr. Lewis puts 13^{33-38} at the end of 16; while Dr. Moffatt puts 13^{31b-38} in that position. Dr. Macgregor would dismiss 13^{36-38} as the work of a redactor; but to me the passage seems quite unlike a redactor's addition, in view of its integral connexion with the later account of Peter's denial. But might it not find a place at the very end of the discourse? Our Lord says 'Arise, let us go hence.' Peter asks, with no mystical meaning, but with a natural desire to know the immediate sequel, 'Lord, whither art Thou going?' And the rest follows. This change would be in harmony with the Synoptists, who place the warning to Peter either just before the Upper Room is left, or on the way to the Garden. In Mark and Matthew, too, it follows immediately on the reference to the Shepherd being smitten and the sheep scattered, of which 16^{32} is obviously the Johannine equivalent. There are two confirmatory considerations. First, our Lord's statement in 16^{5} would become literally correct; and, secondly, it would become possible to regard Peter's 'I will lay down my life for Thee' as an echo of Jesus's great saying in 15^{13}.

Neither Mr. Hoare nor Mr. Lewis proposes any rearrangement after ch. 16.

Recent Foreign Theology.

The distinguished French archæologist, Professor P. Montet, of Strasbourg, published in 1940 a survey of the history of Avaris,[1] that is of interest to Biblical students because it deals with the **Hyksos period of Egyptian history and the Hebrews in Egypt.** Its title to be referred to amongst *recent* foreign theology is that only now are copies of the work reaching this country.

The author studies the history of Avaris from the earliest times to the latest, utilizing all the Egyptian sources as well as the traditions that have come to us through Greek writers, and traces the chequered career of the city under its various names of Avaris, Pi-Rameses, and Tanis. He adheres to the view that the Exodus took place under Merenptah, and offers archæological reasons for doubting the conclusions reached by Garstang at Jericho. As Garstang has brought down his date slightly,[2] there is but little difference between him and Albright now [3] as to the date of the destruction of Jericho, though there is a whole world of difference as to the place this event held in the Israelite entry into Canaan. These questions lie outside the field of Montet's study, but without some discussion of them the question of the date of Jericho's fall is rather a side issue.

Montet agrees with most writers in placing the descent into Egypt in the Hyksos period, and claims that the fact that the Israelites were in the neighbourhood of the Pharaoh's palace at the time of the going into Egypt and at the time of the Exodus demands the Hyksos period for the one event and the time of Rameses II and his successor for the other. For Goshen was certainly in the Nile Delta region, and the Hyksos and Rameses had one and the same city for their capital in this region, while none of the intervening Pharaohs had a capital in this neighbourhood. This is not wholly convincing, since the Biblical evidence on which Montet here relies shows that while at the time of the Exodus the Israelite settlements were so near to the Pharaoh's palace that the princess was liable to approach them in the course of a walk, at the time of the descent

[1] *Le Drame D'Avaris: essai sur la pénétration des Sémites en Egypte* (1940). Paris: Geuthner.

[2] To 1380 B.C.

[3] Albright's date is *circa* 1360 B.C.

Goshen was at such a respectable distance from the court that the sight of the Israelite shepherds was not likely to offend the eyes of the Egyptians.

Montet suggests that the Biblical statement that Hebron was founded seven years before Zoan (=Tanis)[1] probably refers to the renaming of Avaris or Pi-Rameses by the name Tanis after the time of Rameses II. He observes that Palestinian archæology is not able to date the founding of Hebron. Biblical evidence, however, would suggest that Hebron was much older than the Exodus, and Albright thinks the Biblical writer knew of the era of Tanis, which dated the foundation of the city 400 years before the accession of Rameses I., or in the Hyksos period.[2]

While, therefore, Montet's book will not finally settle all the issues it deals with, it provides some valuable materials for their discussion, and its collection of all the facts that are known about Avaris—which on any view has an important place in the Israelite experience in Egypt—gives it real value for all students of this most vexed of all questions of Israelite history.

To the volume of literature on **the Ras Shamra texts,** the Belgian scholar R. de Langhe has made a large contribution in the form of a two-volume work dealing with the relations of these texts with the Biblical milieu of the Old Testament.[3] It deals with the history of the decipherment of the texts, their variety of script and language, the place of the Ras Shamra dialect in the family of Semitic languages, the organization of family and state in the ancient city of Ugarit, and the geographical and historical references that have been held to stand in the texts. The whole is a massive and scholarly work, which can be ignored by none who would be abreast of work in this young, but very important, field of study.

In the little work which the late J. W. Jack published on the Ras Shamra texts[4] in 1935, the views of Dussaud and Virolleaud were followed. These scholars found some references in one of the texts to the Negeb and to Edom, and propounded the theory that the Ras Shamra community once dwelt in the south of Palestine, and so had a bond of connexion with the Israelites, before their settlement in Canaan. This view is rejected by de Langhe, who finds the places referred to in the north of Palestine. He also rejects the view that certain Biblical names, such as Asher, Zebulun, Dan, Joseph, and Terah are found in the texts. In none of these views is de Langhe alone, but he examines every question with an independent and critical mind, and makes some valuable contribution to the discussion of them all.

[1] Nu 13^{22}.

[2] *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (1940), 184.

[3] *Les Textes de Ras Shamra-Ugarit et leur Rapports avec le Milieu Biblique de l'Ancien Testament* (1945). Gembloux : Duculot, and Paris : Desclée de Brouwer.

[4] *The Ras Shamra Texts : their Bearing on the Old Testament.* Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark.

The greatest regret which many readers will have is that he has left the more directly religious study of the texts, with the estimate of their importance for the study of the Old Testament, to a subsequent work. For there can be no doubt that these texts throw a flood of light on the religion of Canaan in the pre-Settlement period, and the religion of Canaan persisted long after the Settlement, as the Old Testament tells us, alongside, and often fused with, the religion which Israel brought with her into the land. It were ungracious to complain, when Dr. de Langhe has given us so much, and when treatment on the same grand scale would have increased an already vast work to much vaster proportions, but it is to be hoped that the same wealth of scholarship and caution in judgment will soon be brought to the religious side of the texts.

Of the discussion of the problems of the **Fourth Gospel** there is no end. Neither is there likely to be. In a brief study that is packed with valuable matter, Professor P. H. Menoud reviews their recent discussion.[5] The definition of 'recent' is not very precise, and while the work of the last twenty years is covered in a general way, attention is more especially concentrated on the work of the last ten years. The work of British and American writers during the war years was not accessible to the author, but continental books from widely scattered writers, many of which are new to British readers, are here laid under contribution and have their special point of view set forth. All readers who would be in touch with current work on this part of the New Testament field will find this book worth far more than its modest cost.

Menoud shows that recent trends are against the dissection of the Gospel, and against any large theories of the dependence of the writer on oriental and gnostic thought, while the 'Mandæan fever' has now abated. Further, whereas a generation ago it was critical heresy to attribute the Gospel and the Apocalypse to a single author, the majority opinion to-day is in favour of unity of authorship. As to whether that author was one of the twelve disciples, there is still no agreement, though 'the defenders of the Johannine authenticity stand to-day in more favourable positions than at the beginning of the century.' These are conclusions objectively reached, not as an exposé of the author's own views, but by a critical review of recent trends. For Menoud himself believes that the riddle of this Gospel is still far from its solution. This is emphatically a book to buy, not merely for the New Testament specialist, but for every student of the New Testament who would be informed about the scholarship of to-day.

H. H. Rowley.

Manchester.

[5] *L'Évangile de Jean d'après les recherches récentes* (1943). Neuchâtel : Delachaux & Niestlé.

Contributions and Comments.

Galatians vi. 1.

Ἀδελφοὶ ἐὰν καὶ προλημφθῇ ἄνθρωπος ἔν τινι παράπτώματι. These opening words of the last chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians are rendered : ' Brethren, even if a man be overtaken in any trespass ' in the Revised Version, without marginal alternative. Nevertheless they contain some difficulties for the translator. The verb προλαμβάνω is found only three times in the New Testament, and in the other texts (Mk 14^{8} and 1 Co 11^{21}), the meaning approximates to the primary significance of ' to take before.' This, however, would not suit the present context, and it is necessary to search for other examples to explain the exact sense. It is similarly employed in Wisdom 17^{17}, and is translated ' overtake ' in the Revised Version of the Apocrypha, and Moulton and Milligan in their Vocabulary quote a passage from a Papyrus document which they render : ' that if you think fit you may act before she is entrapped,' and they explain that the reference is to a girl against whom a plot had been formed. This evidence would support a meaning like ' surprise ' or ' overtake ' here. The recent versions, however, break away from this sense entirely, and Way (1901) has ' detect,' and he is followed by both Moffatt and Weymouth. Of this translation it may be said that a significance which implies some effort at finding out does not seem to accord with any recorded use of this Greek verb. Then there is ' ἔν ' which has been taken in its usual meaning of ' in,' but surely it would be possible to regard it here as the instrumental ' ἔν ' and to translate it as ' by.' The Revisers have often been criticized for having paid too much attention to classical rules, and this is certainly a case in which they would have been justified in a rendering which would have been more in accordance with St. Paul's general teaching. The Great Apostle had a true appreciation of individual freedom, about which he wrote frequently, and in this same Epistle he has used very strong words about those ' who came in privily to spy out our liberty.' There is no doubt that he would have vehemently opposed the establishment of a Spiritual Gestapo, whose members would have tried to detect people in wrong-doing. So I suggest that the real meaning of this advice, applicable not only to the converts of St. Paul but to Christians of all the ages, is that if a man is surprised or overtaken by any fault or sin, his fellows are not to sneer at him, but to restore him. They are to cultivate the spirit of meekness, not that of fault-finding, and they are to remember that they may be tempted and that they may fall themselves. Two authorities may be quoted in support of translating ' ἔν ' as ' by ' in this text. Moulton, who says : ' but it seems fair to argue that an instrumental sense for ' ἔν ' is generally available if the context strongly pleads for it ' (*Prolegomena*, 61), and Luther who translates ' by any fault ' (von einem Fehler).

J. D. Robb.

Belfast.

Acts xix. 14.

I was looking through Mommsen's *Provinces of the Roman Empire* the other day, and found in Vol. I. pp. 345–350, a passage that has explained for me the title ' ἀρχιερεύς ' as applied to *Sceva a Jew.* (See especially note on p. 347—ἀρχιερεὺς ναῶν τῶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ [inscription]). There were apparently not only ἀσιάρχαι (19^{31}) but also ἀρχιερεῖς in each city, whose duty it was to supervise the Emperor Cult and Temple worship. Sceva may have been one of such—if so, how history repeats itself ! He was ἀρχιερεύς of the Nazi church, not of the Confessional.

B. E. Taylor.

Liverpool.

Entre Nous.

Music and Worship—a Criticism and a Forecast.

I have just attended a great evangelistic meeting and have come home feeling puzzled. Why is it, I wonder, that evangelists almost invariably choose such trumpery music to reinforce their gospel appeals ? Does the best message of all really deserve the worst possible music ? This afternoon, for instance, two thousand of us were invited to recall in song the story of the Good Shepherd laying down His life for the sheep. And how was that most sacred subject treated musically ? The tune was written in the mood and tempo of a musical comedy ! So strong was its rhythm that had the audience not met for a religious purpose they would instinctively have

started dancing to it. As it was the arms of the evangelist enjoyed a freedom of action denied to the feet of the audience.

And so I have come away feeling puzzled. Must gospel preaching always be supported only by music which offends good taste? If so, are evangelism and culture antagonists? Or is such trivial music really not to the glory of God at all? Is it, in fact, just a case of stirrings of the emotions being mistaken for movements of the Spirit?

The question suggested by the evangelistic meeting leads one to the greater problem of the proper relationship between music and worship in general. And when considering this it is, perhaps, just as well to remind ourselves first of all that, when we gather for worship, we gather not as musicians but as believers. Our rights and privileges at the Throne of Grace are unaffected by our musical tastes which may vary from Billy Mayerl to Mozart. How then is it possible for the music of the Church to appeal to such a diversity of musical opinion? Quite obviously it is not possible. But in this matter our varying modes of Christian worship are of value. Too often we think of the sundry denominations only as so many 'unhappy divisions,' but they do at least serve the useful purpose of meeting our temperamental differences. And our theology is probably influenced by our temperament to a far greater extent than is normally recognized.

But if it be admitted that we cannot all worship alike because we are not all alike temperamentally, it behoves us to consider whether many more might not be induced to share in worship were we to improve the standard and extend the scope of the musical part of our services. For my part I am confident that the days ahead will witness many changes in the Church's life and worship, and I look for many of those changes to be initiated in the more progressive Free Churches. On every hand we hear that the Church of to-morrow must be different. It must be different in its attitude towards social problems. It must be different in this way and that, and we may be sure that, amidst all the coming changes, our present system of worship will not be allowed to escape alteration.

The Church of to-morrow will find that her congregations will not be satisfied with just the customary staple diet of two organ voluntaries and four or five hymn tunes, nor will her people, who have listened at home for six days of the week to good music, be content to listen on the seventh day to nothing but the very imperfect renderings of the average church choir. In Britain there has recently been a rapid development in musical culture. This is evidenced, *inter alia*, by the increased popularity of the Promenade Concerts and by the extended number of listening hours allotted to serious music by the B.B.C. To their credit the cinema magnates have been quick to recognize this public demand for good music and have met it by commissioning the best composers to write film music, and by including the classics in the popular films of the day.

What, then, can the Church do? She obviously has not the riches of the entertainment world to spend on music, nor can she expect her choirs of good Christians rather than good singers to be as talented as say the Choral Societies whose members are bound together by music alone. But is there any real necessity why we should depend entirely on the limited capacities of our own particular church organist and choir to supply us with our music for worship? I think not; and it is here that the Church will be required to make a bold innovation. Whether we like it or not we have to admit that we are living in a mechanized age. To the sound of the gramophone and the radio our children are educated in the school, and to the sound of the same machines our workers are spurred on in the factory. Is it not then almost certain that by the magic of recorded music we shall hear, within the walls of our own church, the choirs of all 'nations, and kindreds, and people and tongues' ascribing praise and glory to God in the one, universal language of music? It was on 17th June, 1660, a month after the King's return, that Pepys wrote in his diary, 'This day the organs did begin to play at White Hall before the King.' And perhaps I shall live long enough to be able to record in my less celebrated diary, 'This day the gramophones did begin to play in Westminster Abbey before the Dean.' Or will it be in the rebuilt City Temple before the President of the Free Church Council?

REGINALD G. RUSSELL.

Brighton.

Biblical Doubt.

'It is remarkable, moreover, how quickly doubt in the Bible changes its nature and turns to penitence; how rapidly it becomes involved in a mood and attitude of deep self-searching. Penitence, one might say, is the Bible form of pessimism. The doubt which, in the natural man, leads to pessimism, in the Biblical man, leads to penitence. There is no pessimism in the Bible. The one illustration that might be quoted is to be found in the Book of Ecclesiastes. It may be questioned, however, whether the author of that book is to be called a pessimist. But it is significant that he, who comes nearest to that designation, is one who from a certain detached attitude reflects and broods on the ills and contradictions of life, rather than one who is in close and dire conflict with them. He is a thinker rather than a real striver and struggler. The truly Biblical man is sometimes a doubter, but a doubter whose doubt is quickly convertible into penitence. There is a logic in Biblical doubt other than the logic of ordinary natural doubt. This logic says, in effect: "yes, life is evil, but that means primarily that it calls for reparation, atonement, repentance." The evil of life creates upon the Biblical man an impression different from that which it makes on the ordinary, natural man. May it not be that he sees it from a standpoint other than that of natural reason; from God's standpoint in fact? . . . The question may suggest the consideration that the relation

of the world to God, and of God to the world, may be a very different one than we suppose when we take evils of life as grounds for doubting God. They may, in fact, be just the opposite. They may be grounds for believing in Him.' [1]

Preachers.

Preachers I Have Heard, by Mr. Alexander Gammie (Pickering & Inglis ; 12s. 6d. net).

The older generation of churchmen especially, clerical and lay, will find this book interesting. We have heard a great many of these famous preachers. There are fifty-seven of them here, and they are certainly a mixed crowd. Not a few of them will cause a lifting of the eyebrows : 'What are *you* doing among the mighty ? ' But on the whole, Mr. Gammie has chosen his subjects wisely, although he has apparently not gone far outside Presbyterianism or Nonconformity. Of the fifty-seven only two, the late Archbishop Temple and Studdert-Kennedy, are Episcopalians. But we have, within these limits, many familiar and famous names ; Dr. Whyte of St. George's, Dr. George Matheson, Dr. James Macgregor, Dr. John Hunter occupy places of honour. Of these and others many good stories are told here, some of them pretty well known but others new, and the writer has rescued from oblivion a number of striking sayings descriptive of his subjects, like J. M. Barrie's tribute to Dr. Whyte, 'To know Dr. Whyte was to know what the Covenanters were like in their most splendid hours.'

One of the most striking figures in the Edinburgh pulpit of my youth was Dr. George Matheson, the blind minister of St. Bernard's church. His preaching was brilliant, and sometimes startlingly original. I remember him beginning a sermon (it was the ' action ' sermon before Communion) on the text, ' We thus judge that if one died for all then all died,' thus : ' This is the editorial we. St. Paul means : this is my opinion about the Atonement. I do not always agree with St. Paul, but I am happy to say that on this occasion it is my opinion also.' A friend of mine went to hear him one day and coming out he asked one of the elders : ' Is he always as great as that ? ' ' Always,' said the elder, ' but we sometimes long for a little plain bread.' It will interest many people to hear that Dr. Matheson said of his famous hymn, ' O love that wilt not let me go,' that it came to him as an inspiration, as if it were dictated, and took no more than five minutes to compose.

One could wander through this book, pausing at many names and adding personal reminiscences of their sayings and doings. But, dipping into it, one is left with some reflections about preachers and preaching. One is that they need to be *heard.* There are many preachers whose sermons are quite dull to read. Dr. John Kelman, a very great preacher, was one. Not many can communicate the fire and life of their personality to the printed page. Another reflection is that preaching has changed because the hearers have changed. What congregation would listen to-day to Principal Fairbairn's hour-long sermons ?

This is an age of snippets, of ' digests.' Lloyd George once said (in private) that the reason why he could speak straight on for an hour in Scotland while in London he must stop and give some light relief from time to time was that people in Scotland were taught to listen in church, in London in the music hall. Would he have ground for that to-day ?

Another thing. Not many living preachers have the stature of the greatest of these fifty-seven. Is it because they had a blazing certainty which is not so marked to-day ? Or is it because there are tides of the Spirit ? Or is it that the atmosphere to-day is colder ? ' Like priest like people '—yes, but as truly ' like people like priest.' Let us hope and pray for a full tide.

F. J. RAE.

[1] F. W. Camfield, *The Collapse of Doubt,* 22.

Disinterestedness.

In Margaret Cole's sketch of *Beatrice Webb* occurs this suggestive tribute to one side of the character of her husband Sidney.

' He was entirely devoid of any desire to claim credit for his own work ; if the pamphlet or whatever it was would be more effective if it appeared anonymously, let it appear anonymously —or under the name of anyone, carrying more weight or appearing more important, who would be prepared to sign it. This disinterestedness, this utter lack of personal vanity of any kind, has been for all his life one of the most marked characteristics of Sidney Webb. He has never minded at all, provided the work was done, who got the credit for it.'

New Series.

We have begun a new series of articles this month. The idea was suggested by the Report of the Archbishop's Evangelistic Commission, *Towards the Conversion of England.* Following the article by the Rev. Canon H. G. G. Herklots there will be one by the Bishop of Rochester, who was Chairman of the Commission. His subject is *The Clergy and Evangelism.* The other subjects already arranged are : *The Church and Evangelism,* by the Rev. Canon Roger B. Lloyd ; *Village Evangelism,* by the Bishop of Southampton ; *Evangelism and the Young,* by the Rev. Bryan S. W. Green ; *The Laity and Evangelism,* by the Very Rev. C. K. N. Bardsley ; *Modern Agencies of Propaganda,* by the Rev. C. B. Mortlock.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.